

**THE COLLEGE MAN AND
THE COLLEGE WOMAN**



vs

THE COLLEGE MAN AND THE COLLEGE WOMAN

BY

WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE

President of Bowdoin College



BOSTON AND NEW YORK
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY

The Riverside Press, Cambridge

1906

Copy 2

LIBRARY of CONGRESS
Two Copies Received
MAR 8 1906
Copyright Entry
Mar 7, 1906
CLASS a, XXC. No.
140161
COPY A.

LB2321
H95
copy 2

COPYRIGHT 1906 BY WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Published March 1906

TO
THEODORE ROOSEVELT
WHO AS LEGISLATOR, COMMISSIONER, SECRETARY
COLONEL, AUTHOR, GOVERNOR
VICE-PRESIDENT, PRESIDENT AND PEACEMAKER
HAS WROUGHT IN THE WORLD
WHAT HE WAS TAUGHT IN COLLEGE
AND SHOWN THE POWER FOR GOOD
A COLLEGE MAN CAN BE

PREFACE

Now that we have about sixty thousand men and thirty thousand women in the colleges of the United States, the College Man and the College Woman deserve sympathetic interpretation and intelligent appreciation. To reveal to themselves and to the world these college men and women as they are, and as they are capable of becoming, is the purpose of this book. It deals with the personal, ethical, spiritual side of college life, and with organization and administration only incidentally. It presents as the best spiritual drink for college youth a blend of Greek sanity and Christian service.

Nearly everything in it has been presented to college audiences at Harvard, Yale, Pennsylvania, Syracuse, Chicago, Northwestern, Amherst, Bowdoin, Dartmouth, Williams, Haverford, Colgate, Mount Holyoke, Rockford, Smith, Vassar, or Wellesley. Nearly all of it has been printed in "The Atlantic Monthly," "Scribner's Magazine," "The Educational Review," "The International Monthly," "The Outlook," Crowell's "What is Worth While" Series, or pamphlets published by colleges to which the addresses were delivered. Taken as a whole, they represent what twenty

years of life in a college have taught me, and what I in turn have tried to teach others, about what college students mean to be, and what college graduates may be expected to become. I trust it may assure over-anxious parents that not every aberration of their sons and daughters while in college is either final or fatal; persuade critics of college administration that our problem is not so simple as they seem to think; and inspire the public with the conviction, cherished by every college officer, that college students, with all their faults and follies, are the best fellows in the world; and that notwithstanding much crude speculation about things human, and some honest skepticism concerning things divine, the great social institutions of family and industry and church and state may be safely intrusted to their hearts and hands.

The literary form of the second chapter, though unusual, was unavoidable. The college undergraduate is a being of too complex and swiftly changing phases for external description to catch and reproduce. If he is to be truthfully depicted at all, the only way is to place him in intimate and confidential relations and let him "give himself away."

The one biographical chapter is introduced because the office of college president is preëminently a personal office, and is best described in terms of a life and work which express a personal character.

I have ventured to recognize the fact that man

and woman are not just alike, and to suggest that what God has put asunder man cannot satisfactorily join together.

While I have introduced two or three college sermons, it will be evident that the main reliance of a college for its moulding of men and women is not preaching or exhortation, still less rules and regulations, least of all threats and penalties; but actual living, in an atmosphere of freedom, where each person has returned to him frankly, swiftly, mercilessly, the social judgment that his acts invite and his character deserves. The ethical and spiritual fruits of a college course, likewise, are not to be measured mainly by verbal professions of piety and virtue, but by those deep-grooved sub-conscious habits of good-fellowship and courtesy, kindness and courage, thoroughness and patience, sincerity and sympathy, serviceableness and self-sacrifice, which, whether in the press of business and the clash of politics, or in the quiet of home and the joy of the social circle, are the marks of the true College Man and College Woman.


WILLIAM DEWITT HYDE.

BOWDOIN COLLEGE,
BRUNSWICK, MAINE.



CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. THE OFFER OF THE COLLEGE . . .	3
II. THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE UNDER-GRADUATE	4
III. GREEK QUALITIES IN THE COLLEGE MAN	46
IV. THE CAREER OF SELF-CONQUEST . . .	81
V. THE CONTINUITY AND CONTRAST OF COLLEGE AND THE WORLD . . .	114
VI. THE MORE EXCELLENT WAY . . .	129
VII. THE SACRIFICES OF A COLLEGE MAN .	150
VIII. THE CREED OF A COLLEGE CLASS .	169
IX. THE CHOICE OF THE COLLEGE WOMAN	175
X. THE WORTH OF THE WOMANLY IDEAL	194
XI. THE EARNINGS OF COLLEGE GRADUATES	219
XII. A GREAT COLLEGE PRESIDENT .	223
XIII. THE PERSONALITY OF THE TEACHER .	247
XIV. THE SIX PARTNERS IN COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION	275
XV. THE COLLEGE	306
XVI. ALUMNI IDEALS	332



**THE COLLEGE MAN AND
THE COLLEGE WOMAN**

THE COLLEGE MAN AND THE COLLEGE WOMAN

I

The Offer of the College

TO be at home in all lands and all ages ; to count Nature a familiar acquaintance, and Art an intimate friend ; to gain a standard for the appreciation of other men's work and the criticism of your own ; to carry the keys of the world's library in your pocket, and feel its resources behind you in whatever task you undertake ; to make hosts of friends among the men of your own age who are to be leaders in all walks of life ; to lose yourself in generous enthusiasms and coöperate with others for common ends ; to learn manners from students who are gentlemen, and form character under professors who are Christians, — this is the offer of the college for the best four years of your life.

II

The Transformation of the Undergraduate

FRESHMAN SORROWS

BRADFORD COLLEGE, October 24, 1901.

DEAR FATHER, — Your letter, with welcome check inclosed, is at hand. I note your advice to “ wear the same-sized hat, and keep sawing wood ; ” but really I did n’t need it, for the Sophs attend to the former, and the Profs provide for the latter.

No, I am not suffering from “ swelled head ” yet. You know you wished me to keep up my music. Last week a notice was put up on the bulletin-board, inviting all candidates for the College Glee Club to appear at a certain room, at nine o’clock Saturday evening. Among the candidates who came were two other Freshmen and myself. They told us that we must all put on dress suits, as personal appearance was a large element in fitness for the position. As I did not have any, they lent me one, or rather parts of two, — waistcoat and trousers that were far too small, and a coat that was miles too big. Then they had us come in and make bows, and show how we would lead in a prima donna. Then they had us stand on our heels and sing low notes ; stand on

tiptoes and sing high notes ; sing everything we knew from comic songs to the doxology in long metre ; and finally, about half-past eleven, dismissed us with the statement that the other two were the better singers, but that my presence and personal appearance was greatly in my favor ; and that the decision would be announced on the bulletin-board the next morning. We had not been out of the room two minutes before we recognized that we had been awfully "taken in." I did not sleep much that night ; and whenever I fell into a doze, the vision of that bulletin-board would dance before my eyes and wake me up. If ever I wished I was dead and buried, I did that night. It seemed as if I could never get up and go to breakfast, where they would all be talking about it, and walk into chapel with everybody knowing what a fool I had made of myself the night before. It made me wish I either had taken my dose of this sort of thing three years ago at a fitting school, or else had gone to one of the great universities, where a fellow can be simply a unit in the vast whole, of whom nobody takes the slightest notice. But you always said that the small colleges have a great advantage over the large ones, in the fact that here the individual is made to be somebody, and take the consequences of his own action upon his own head. Well, I have made an ass of myself to begin with ; and everybody knows it and is guying me about it. But I am getting

used to it, and don't mind it as much as I did. I have had a good many calls by way of congratulation on my election to the Glee Club ; and as these were the first calls of persons I had not had the privilege of knowing before, it seemed appropriate (and I was informed that it was an established college custom) that I should treat. I think that by taking the thing good-naturedly, and entertaining my guests handsomely, I have made more friends than I have lost.

Your affectionate son,

CLARENCE MANSFIELD.

BRADFORD COLLEGE, November 6, 1901.

MY DEAR MOTHER, — You say you are “ afraid I am homesick ; ” for I write all “ about things at home and nothing about things here.” Well, I have been just a bit homesick, but I am getting bravely over it. This time I will try to tell you the things you want to know.

You need n't worry about my clothes ; they are all right. I tore a three-cornered hole in my trousers the other day ; but I fixed it up first-rate. I tried one of those fine needles to begin with ; but it was no use. So I fished out a darning-needle, got some black linen thread, and went at it. I took the thread double and twisted, left a long end at the beginning ; sewed it over and over, as you call it, taking stitches about a quarter of an inch apart, fetched back the

end next to the needle to the long end I left at the beginning, and tied them together. Some Sophs made great fun of it; wanted to know if I was trying to demonstrate the *pons asinorum* on my trousers leg. That night I ripped up the whole seam, or whatever you call it, I had made, turned the trousers wrong side out; proceeded as before except that I took stitches only half as big; tied the ends on the inside where they don't show; and the trousers look as good as ever.

You ask particularly about my religious life. I don't know what to say. The first morning I went to chapel, some one who seemed to be the usher asked me if I would like to rent a sitting. I was fool enough to give him a dollar for a seat; and then he ushered me into a pew at one side near the front which is reserved for the Faculty. I tell you I didn't feel much like praying that morning.

The first really familiar and home-like thing I found when I came here was the Y. M. C. A. reception to the Freshmen. A large number of the students and several of the Faculty were present. There were a few addresses of an informal nature by the professors. Then we sang hymns, and refreshments were served. I got acquainted with three of the professors, to one of whom I recite; and the whole affair went a long way toward making me feel at home here.

As for the meetings : well, I go to them regularly. I cannot say I altogether enjoy them. Some of the fellows have such wonderful experiences of grace, that I don't know what to make of it. I never had anything of the kind. If that is essential to a man's being a Christian — why, I simply am not in it. I can't conceive of myself as feeling like that. I don't see the sense of it. It doesn't seem natural. I want to do right. I know I do wrong, — I know I need to be turned right about face once in so often, or else I should go straight down hill. And I am glad to spend an hour each week with the fellows who are trying to get a brace in the same direction.

To tell the truth I don't get much out of church here. The ministers are smart enough, and they roll out great glowing periods. But when they are through I cannot tell for the life of me what they have been driving at. You hear a lot about justification, sanctification, and atonement ; and then you hear a lot about Phrygia, Pamphylia, and Mesopotamia. Once in a while there comes along a man who seems to understand us. He will throw out some practical and moral problem that we are grappling with ; pile up the arguments in favor of the indulgence just as they pile up in our own minds ; and then turn around, knock them all to splinters, and show how much more noble and manly it is to overcome temptation ; and show us

Christ as the great champion in the moral and spiritual warfare of the world.

It is a good deal harder to be a Christian here in college than it was at home, and the things that ought to be a help seem to be a hindrance. I expect to have rather a sorry time of it here for a while; but by far the greatest of my sorrows is that I have not been more faithfully,

Your dutiful and grateful boy,

CLARENCE MANSFIELD.

BRADFORD COLLEGE, May 30, 1902.

DEAR HELEN, — I wonder if time flies as swiftly with you Willoughby College girls as with us? It seems but yesterday that we were gliding along together to the music of the merry sleigh-bells over the glistening snow. Of course you have your good times there. Your afternoon teas tendered by Sophomores to Freshmen; your debates in the gymnasium on municipal suffrage for women; your Halloween frolics; your basket-ball contests; your boat-races rowed for form only; your midnight lunches interrupted by "the Pestilence that walketh in darkness" — that nickname of yours for a meddling Prof. beats the record — are all very delightful as portrayed in your charming letters; but compared with foot-ball and base-ball, boxing and fencing, rushes and tugs-of-war, turkey suppers on the Faculty table with any one of three parties,

the owner of the turkeys, the college authorities, or the upper-classmen, liable to swoop down on you at any moment and gobble up the feast, I must confess that your worst dissipations seem a little tame.

I have no doubt, however, that you make up in study what is lacking in sport. I have n't seen anybody here quite so completely carried away with Sophocles, or so in love with the Odes of Horace, or so fascinated with German syntax as you seem to be. Your lamentations over spherical trigonometry, however, would evoke many a responsive moan. That was really credible from a college man's point of view; but if I were not so sure of your thorough genuineness and sincerity, I should set down those raptures about philologies and trilogies either to satire or to affectation. We men are not taken that way. I am glad you like them, though. To see a little gleam of sense, real or imaginary, through the interminable technical jargon a fellow has to grind out, must be a relief. I am heartily glad for you if the gods have granted you such a special dispensation.

I must confess, though, that I am beginning to get a real hold of Greek. Professor Bird has us read the whole of an author in translation; write essays on the times, characters, customs, and institutions; and then read in the original such passages as are specially significant in throwing light on the main characters and events. We get the

life first in this way ; and the letters afterward as the expression of that life. Then, too, he shows pictures of Greek architecture and art with the stereopticon in the evening ; tells us the story of the statues of which we have casts in the Art Building, and of the coins and vases in the cases there. Life is interesting in all its forms ; and it is slowly dawning upon me that these old fellows lived about the gayest, freest, loveliest life men ever lived on earth. But from the way Greek was ground out in the high school one would never have dreamed the old dry roots once had such sweet juice in them. And some of the other languages here are taught by young fellows fresh from German, or German-American institutions, who regard the text, even of Horace or Goethe or Molière, as just so much grammatical straw to thrash the syntax out of. When I see what Greek is, and what the other languages and literatures might be if only we had a man and not a thesis in cap and gown to teach them, it makes me mad. And yet you girls fall down and worship just that sort of a creature !

Boys and girls make very different kinds of students. I think we get along better apart than together. You are docile, conscientious, and at least outwardly courteous. You eat whatever is set before you, asking no questions for conscience's sake. You study just as hard whether you like a subject or not. You do your best every time.

Now that is very sweet and lovely. But I should think it would spoil your teachers to treat them that way. With us it is different. If we don't like a thing, we say so. As for these fellows that try to cram their old philology down our throats, we make their existence pretty uncomfortable. The other day the Latin tutor asked a fellow the gender of *ovum*, and he answered, "You can't tell until it's hatched." They won't teach us anything we want to know, and so we won't learn anything they want to teach. We keep asking the same old question over and over again; and make him explain the simplest of all his favorite fine distinctions every time it occurs. Well, I must stop somewhere. I really did not know I was so interested in my studies, or had so many theories of education. You always understand me better than anybody else does. When I began this letter, I did n't think I cared much about these things anyway. But you are so in earnest about them, that I believe I have caught the inspiration. I am a many-sided being; some sides are good and some are bad; some are wise and some are very foolish. You always bring out the best side; and for fear of deceiving you and making you think I am better than I really am, I have to let you inside, and show you just how foolish and light-minded I am. If I always had you to talk to, I think I should be a very much more diligent student than I am. Not that I

crave coeducation. Oh, no! What Emerson says of friendship is especially true of the friendship of college boys and girls: "The condition which high friendship demands is ability to do without it. There must be very two, before there can be very one. Let us buy our entrance to this guild by a long probation." I wish you would read the whole essay. I am immensely fond of it; and I always think of you when I read it. The two writers I love best are Carlyle and Emerson; although I don't profess to understand much of either of them. Carlyle braces me up when I am tempted to loaf and shirk. Emerson tones me down when I am tempted to pretense and insincerity. Both tend to make me more simple and true and real — more like what you are and what I fondly fancy you would like to have me be.

Your faithful friend,

CLARENCE MANSFIELD.

SOPHOMORE CONCEITS

BRADFORD COLLEGE, October 25, 1902.

DEAR FATHER, — Now that it is all over, I suppose I may as well tell you about it. Perhaps you saw in the "Herald" that we came near having a class rebellion here yesterday.

Two or three of us ventured to wear, into Professor Bird's recitation-room the other morning, some vestiges of the attire which had done duty in

a parade the previous evening. Professor Bird said that if we wished to make fools of ourselves on the public streets he, as an individual, had nothing to say about it; but that when it came to bringing such nonsense into his recitation-room he would not stand it, and we might leave the room at once.

Immediately after recitation the class held a rousing indignation meeting in Old College Hall, and passed the following resolutions: "That we, the members of the Class of 1905, most emphatically and indignantly protest against this act of tyranny and usurpation; and that we will attend no more college exercises until this wrong shall be redressed."

As I was one of the persons especially aggrieved I was made chairman of a committee of three, which was appointed to wait upon the president and present our resolutions.

He listened very respectfully to our representations. When we had finished he said that there seemed to be a hopeless division of opinion on the subject, — the faculty being firmly and finally committed to the position taken by Professor Bird, and the class being equally tenacious of the position taken in the resolutions. Accordingly, he proposed that we should refer the whole subject to a committee of three alumni, of whom the class should name one, the president should name one, and the two thus appointed should name the third.

The class, after some discussion, voted to accept the president's proposition; and we appointed as our representative on this committee a young graduate of the previous year who had been a leader in all manner of deviltry while he was in college, and is hanging around the college this year as a self-appointed coach of the foot-ball team until he can find something to do. We went back and reported that we had accepted his proposition, and named our referee. The president then gravely announced that he had selected *you* as his representative on the committee to which the matter should be referred; that he would telegraph for you at once; and that he should expect me and the others interested to appear before the committee in the precise apparel which had been the occasion of the controversy.

You can imagine that I was a good deal taken back. I did not relish having you called down here from your business, two hundred miles, to sit in judgment on that question. I thought I could anticipate the decision and the manner in which it would be delivered. So I persuaded the class to drop the matter, and we have resumed attendance at recitations.

I give you the full account. This is all there is in it. The reporters got hold of it and have written it up with a great deal of exaggeration and embellishment. So if you read my name or see my photo-

graph in connection with the instigation of a great rebellion, don't be disturbed, and tell mother not to worry.

Your affectionate son;

CLARENCE.

BRADFORD COLLEGE, November 30, 1902.

MY DEAR HELEN, — The foot-ball season is over, and I must tell you about it. As you know, we won the championship; and I happened to play quite an important part in it. The opposing team was made up of great giants from the farms; while our team were mostly light city boys, quick as lightning, and up to all the tricks and fine points. Their game was to mass themselves on one weak point in the line, and pound away at that time after time. In spite of all that we could do they would gain a few feet each time; and it looked as though they would win by steadily shoving us inch by inch down the field. When they had it almost over, we made a great brace and held them and got the ball.

Then we made a long gain, bringing the ball within forty yards of their goal. The time was nearly up; and if we had lost it again, the game would have been either a tie or a defeat. As a last resort, the signal was given for a goal from the field. The ball was passed to me: I had just time for a drop kick in the general direction of the goal, without an instant for taking aim, when their biggest man came down on me; and that was the

last I can remember. As all my force had gone into the kick, and I was standing still and had almost lost my balance in the act of kicking; while he weighed seventy pounds more than I, and was coming at full speed, you can imagine that I went down with a good deal of force onto the frozen ground.

The next thing I knew I was in my room, and the doctor was working over me. To my first question, "Was it a goal?" the Captain replied, "Yes, old man, you won the game for us." My injury proved to be nothing serious; and a few stitches in a scalp wound was all the medical treatment necessary. By the way, don't mention this part of the affair around home, where the folks will be likely to hear of it. They would worry, and that would do no good. I was at some loss how to charge up the doctor's bill on my cash account; but in view of the stitches, I charged it to "sewing." I am just having a glorious time of it this year. There are lots of foolish girls here, as there are everywhere; and I don't see why a fellow should not have some fun with them. My foot-ball prowess has opened the doors of all the best society to me; and I am lionized wherever I go. I can take my pick of the girls; and I get along with them first-rate. They talk foot-ball as soon as they are introduced; and that is a subject on which I feel perfectly at home. There are half a dozen on whom I have made a

perfect mash ; and perhaps I ought to confess that there is one in particular toward whom I am inclined to reciprocate. She is a little older than I (some of the fellows who are jealous of me call her the college widow), but with shrugging of her shoulders and elevating her eyes when one makes a particularly piquant remark, she is young enough in her manner. We led the dance the other evening, and it was great fun to see the fellows green with envy, and the longing looks of more than one girl whose eyes as much as said, "Oh, if I were only where that girl is."

I was considerably amused at the account you gave of your harmless serenade under the windows of the obstreperous Miss K. ; but I was disgusted at the specimen of petticoat government that followed. How perfectly absurd to scold a set of such innocent and guileless creatures, who never entertained so much as a shadow of a naughty thought in all your lives !

Our dean would n't have made such a fuss over a little thing like that. Let me tell you what happened here the other night. We have an instructor whom we hate. I don't know just why. He is a wooden fellow. He tries to apply high-school methods of discipline and instruction to college men ! Just think of it ! We don't propose to stand it. So we "fixed" his recitation-room the other night, and among other things propped up the

skeleton from the Medical School in his chair, and put between his teeth strips of paper on which the instructor's oft-recurring phrases were inscribed. I was in it. The dean got onto it, and I was summoned to his office. I expected I should catch it, and was making arrangements to leave town on an early train.

The dean, however, did not refer to the affair once. He said that he was afraid that I was not giving to my studies the undivided attention that they deserved, and asked what was the trouble. We talked over my plans and purposes in so far as I have any; and then he tried to show me how these studies in general, and the one which is taught in that room in particular, have a vital relation to my whole intellectual future. I never realized before how hard the college is trying, with very scanty resources, to provide for us a satisfactory course, or how interested in our individual welfare the officers of it are. I came away with a very much better understanding of what I am here for. I had a very pleasant interview, and was almost glad to have had it; though after the tacit understanding to which we came, it would be fearfully embarrassing to have another based on a similar offense. I shall give the college no further trouble along that line, I assure you.

Now, was not this masculine mode of discipline better than yours? Women seem to read their

Scriptures to the effect that without shedding of tears, there shall be no remission of mischief. We men don't take much stock in tears. And such tear-provoking talk as seems to be so efficacious with you girls would run off from our toughened consciences like water off a duck's back.

Now, my dear Helen, if I seem to hold women in general, and women's ways of doing things, in somewhat light esteem, you know I regard you as a shining exception; and think whatever you do is perfect; and know you must have looked perfectly lovely even in those absurd and wasted tears.

Faithfully your friend,

CLARENCE MANSFIELD.

BRADFORD COLLEGE, April 8, 1903.

MY DEAR MOTHER, — That is just like you, mother, "to look with more favor on my friendship for Helen than on my passion for Kate," or the "college widow," as you hatefully insist on calling her. You are a woman, and you can't see things as I do. Why, Kate just adores me; idolizes me; says that in all the history of the college there never was a fellow quite like me. Now, that is the sort of a girl for me. She makes me feel satisfied with myself. And she *is* pretty and fascinating.

As for Helen, what do you think she had the impertinence to write to me? I had written her a nice letter, in which, to be sure, I made one or two

slighting and patronizing references to women in general and petticoat government for colleges in particular, and this is what I got:—

“YOU HORRID, CONCEITED THING,—No, thank you. If you cannot respect my sex, and speak respectfully of my college, please pay no more of your silly compliments to a ‘shining exception.’

“P. S. If in addition to the fact of feminine foolishness, of which you are so well assured, you wish to continue your studies into the philosophy of the phenomenon, and in spite of her being a woman will for once consult the world’s greatest novelist (perhaps you can bring yourself to it, in view of her masculine pseudonym), you are most respectfully referred to a remark of Mrs. Poyser on the subject.”

Now, you surely don’t suppose a college Sophomore is going to stand such talk as that. The remark referred to is, “I’m not denyin’ that women are foolish; God Almighty made ’em to match the men.”

I have had enough of Helen. What a fellow wants of a girl is some one to reflect with a halo of sympathy and admiration his own views and opinions. He does n’t want to be stirred up and set to thinking. Now, you know I want to please you in everything. But in these matters you must admit that I am a more competent judge of what suits me than anybody else can be for me. I

always respected Helen, and do still. But for real solid happiness all to ourselves, give me Kate every time. So don't worry, Mother. It will all come out right in the end, and you will come to see these things as I do.

As for the Y. M. C. A. and that sort of thing which you inquire about, to tell the truth I have n't been much lately. Between foot-ball and society my time has been pretty well taken up. I believe in having a good time, and letting everybody else have the same; I believe in father's version of the Golden Rule, which is, you know, "Do to others as you think they would do to you if they had a chance." I don't see why we should try to cast our lives in the narrow and contracted grooves marked out for us in primitive times, when the world was just emerging from barbarism.

I recognize, of course, that life, like every game, has its rules, which you must obey if you want to get any fun out of it. But it strikes me that for the rules of life you must go to the men who have studied life from its first beginnings in plant and animal up to its latest development in the modern man. Mill and Spencer, Huxley and Tyndall, ought to be better authorities on the rules of this game than the ingenious priests who relieved the monotony of exile by drawing up an ideal code and attributing it to Moses; men on whose minds the first principles of the synthetic philosophy had never

dawned, and who had no more conception of the conditions which evolution has brought about in our day than the man in the moon.

Now, I mean to do my best, as soon as I get time, to find out what the rules of life are according to the most approved modern authorities ; and then to play the game of life as I do the game of foot-ball, fair and hard. I shall never cheat, never shirk, never be afraid. There's my creed up to date. If there are any other rules delivered by competent authority, and accepted by all players of good standing, I shall obey them too.

So don't be anxious about my religious condition. If you don't like my creed, my practice is all right. I haven't done anything I would be ashamed to have you know ; except a little foolishness that doesn't amount to anything, and is n't worth mentioning. And as long as I honestly try to do as you would have me, I can't go far astray.

Your affectionate

CLARENCE.

JUNIOR MISGIVINGS

BRADFORD COLLEGE, October 14, 1903.

MY DEAR MOTHER,— Well, you were right, after all. My affair with Kate is off ; and my only regret is that it was ever on. She is a sweet creature, and I am sorry to have caused her pain. But she is light-hearted, and she will soon get over it.

She was in love with being in love, in love with the good times I gave her, never in love with me. We never really cared for the same things. That whirl of gayety she likes to live in would be fearfully sickening to me if I had to have it long. We were not happy together, unless we were going somewhere, or had some excitement or other on hand. She will not long remain inconsolable.

Of course I shall come in for a liberal amount of criticism at the sewing circles and afternoon teas, and the women's club. I know I have done wrong, but I did n't mean to. And really it is n't as bad as it looks. We never were engaged, though people may have thought we were. That I have made the biggest kind of a fool of myself, I must of course acknowledge.

One thing is sure. I shall have nothing more to do with young ladies. I am going to give my entire attention to my studies. The great economic and social questions that are pressing for solution demand the undivided attention of every serious man. I am coming to feel more and more as though my mission in life might lie in that direction. Once in the thick of the fight for economic justice and social equality, I shall have little time to think of private domestic happiness. I shall never marry. All petty personal pleasures must be cast aside as cumbersome impediments by one who will serve the cause of the poor and the oppressed. You, dear

Mother, will be henceforth my only feminine confidant and counselor.

As for those religious matters which seem to be your main concern, I am afraid I can't give you much satisfaction. I have discovered that the rules of the great game of life are not so simple as I at first supposed. I see at last what you mean by your doctrine of self-sacrifice. In base-ball we often have to make what we call a sacrifice hit, which brings in another runner while the batter himself gets put out. Then, too, the question sometimes comes up whether to try for a very hard ball, and take ten chances to one of making an error and spoiling your individual record; or only pretend to try and miss it, and so save your individual record at the expense perhaps of losing the game. Essentially the same principle comes out in all our games. In hare and hounds the hares run over the most difficult and devious course they can find, dropping pieces of paper behind them at intervals for scent. Then the hounds come after them on this trail. All goes well as long as the trail is clear and the scent is good. Then we come to a point where all scent stops. Then the lazy shirks sit down and wait, while the energetic fellows strike out in all directions, until one of them finds the trail. He shouts to the others, and they all follow him. Now, this willingness to strike out and help find the trail for the rest, instead of sitting down and resting and letting

some one else do it, is, I suppose, what you mean by self-sacrifice. Now, I accept all that. But it seems to me that the sacrifices demanded in real life are not stereotyped, cut-and-dried forms of traditional self-denial. Life is just like the game. Society is all the time being brought up short at places where it is impossible to tell which of several possible courses it is best to pursue. Then we need men who are not afraid to strike out and find a way, where no sure way appears. Then we need men who have the courage to make necessary mistakes.

Now, this willingness to take on one's self the risk and responsibilities of leadership in matters which are still uncertain seems to me to be the very essence of the heroism modern society requires. If there is any type of men I hate, it is the stupid, timid conservatives, who stand still or turn back whenever they come to a novel problem or a hard place; and then boast that they never go astray. Of course they don't. But, on the other hand, they never help anybody to find the way; they are not leaders.

Now, I gladly admit that Jesus taught the world once for all the great lesson of this self-devotion of the individual to the service of society. While others had anticipated special aspects and applications of this principle, he made it central and supreme. In doing so he became the Lord and Master of all who are willing to become humble servants of their fellow-men. I acknowledge him as my Lord

and Master ; and that, too, in a much profounder sense than I ever supposed the words could mean. I do not, however, find much of this which I regard as the essence of Christ's teaching and spirit, either in traditional theology or conventional Christianity. Orthodox theology seems to have been built up around the idea of saving the merely individual soul, while Christ's prime concern was to show men how to lose that selfish sort of soul.

In short, I propose to tackle the most pressing problem of the present day, that of the just distribution of the products of human toil ; and I propose to give my time and talents and to throw away my wealth and position, for the sake of contributing what I can to its solution. That is what, as I conceive it, Jesus would do were he in my place to-day. Now, if leaving all and following Jesus is Christianity, I am and mean to be a Christian. But if you insist on the ecclesiastical definition of the term, then I am not a Christian, and probably never shall be. Whatever I am, I shall always be

Your obedient and devoted son,

CLARENCE MANSFIELD.

BRADFORD COLLEGE, January 26, 1904.

MY DEAR NELLIE, — So you have made up your mind to go into a college settlement. Well, I congratulate you. Still, I don't quite like it. To be sure, it is a good thing in itself, but it does n't seem

to me that it is the best thing for you. If I had the disposition of your fate I think I could find something better than that for you. With your gentle, sensitive nature, it has always seemed to me that you were better fitted to make some one man happy and some one home sweet and beautiful than to go into the wholesale benevolent business. However, I ought not to find fault, for I am thinking seriously of doing something very much like that myself. Instead of trying to relieve here and there a few cases of misery and degradation, as promiscuous charity tries to do, and instead of trying to elevate the tone of this, that, and the other plague spot in the social system, as the settlement does, I mean to strike at the root of the whole evil and try to remove the causes of which all these notorious evils you refer to are the corollaries and effects.

In other words, I intend to devote my life to the cause of labor, and to the prosecution of such reforms as may be necessary to secure for labor its just share of the wealth which it produces.

I will not weary you with a lengthy account of all the details of my programme. In fact, they are not very clear in my own mind yet.

I have expected to find myself a lonely and rejected social outcast in consequence of the adoption of these views and devotion to this work. But knowing that you feel the evils of the existing order as keenly as I do, and are to devote your life to

binding up the wounds they cause, as I am to devote mine to finding a substitute for the cruel competition which does the cutting, I feel renewed comfort and confidence and courage in my undertaking. Assured of your sympathy and appreciation, I shall not mind what the rest of the world may say. Even if we do not see each other often, our work will be in common for the same great ends. And while I am struggling to secure for the bread-winner a larger portion of the product of his toil, you will be teaching the wife and daughters how to make better use of their increased earnings.

I may as well confess that I had begun to cherish the hope of a closer union ; but it seems that the call for renunciation of private happiness has come to us both alike, and I suppose we must be content to lose all thought of individual happiness in the consciousness of devotion to a common cause. I cannot tell you how great a support even this connection with you is to me. It is so much so that I am sometimes afraid it is the desire to be in sympathy with you, quite as much as my own consecration to the cause, that has led me to renounce my opportunity for worldly success, and enlist in this crusade in behalf of the poor and the oppressed. Still I shall endeavor to serve the cause for its own sake, for I know no other motive for it would find favor in your eyes.

In the earnest hope that I may be found worthy

to be your humble co-worker in this glorious cause,
I am

Most sincerely yours,

CLARENCE MANSFIELD.

BRADFORD COLLEGE, February 22, 1904.

MY DEAR FATHER, — Your question as to what I am going to do when I get through college has set me to thinking. The more I think, the less I am able to answer it. The fact is, I am all stirred up and unsettled. College has raised a thousand questions, and thus far seems to have answered none. I am as much, yes, rather more of a Christian than when I came here; but the creed which I accepted then as a matter of course, now bristles with interrogation points, to say the least, on every side. So that the ministry is out of the question, even if I were adapted to it. I am not a book-worm, and so I stand no show for teaching. I am not a good debater; I should never do for law. For medicine I have not the slightest taste. I am afraid I never shall be good for anything.

Business seems to be the only opening; and yet I don't like to take that as a last resort. One ought to feel drawn toward that, if he is going into it, and not be driven to it like a slave.

Besides, I am beginning to question whether there is any chance for an honest man in business nowadays. I have been reading a good deal of socialistic literature lately, and I am not sure that they

may not be right, and the rest of us all wrong. It does n't seem quite the fair thing that I should be here, living in idleness and comparative luxury, with a practical certainty of a competence all my days whether I do any work or not, while millions of my fellow-men are toiling for the bare necessities of a miserable subsistence.

I can't see why, just because grandfather happened to settle when the town was a wilderness on a farm which included the whole mill-privileges of the present city — I really can't see why we should be practically levying an assessment on every poor weaver with a big family of children, and every hard-worked woman with aged parents to support, that works in our mills or lives in our tenements.

Then your joining the trust last year was the last straw on the breaking back of my lingering faith in the present industrial system. If a trust is n't robbery with both hands, forcing down the wages of the laborer, and putting up the price of goods to the consumer, I should like to know what is. Has not the thing a trust aims to accomplish, been forbidden by law ever since English law began to be framed? Have not the legislatures of half our States passed enactments against it? Is it not denounced on the platform and in the press as the most glaring injustice and iniquity of the present generation?

I know that you are scrupulously honest and up-

right; and that you would not do anything unless you were first convinced of its justice. But I have come to look at these things in the light of abstract principles; and in that light they stand before my mind convicted of injustice and condemned to be superseded by more equitable arrangements. Just what that better order is to be, I am not sure. Perhaps I am in the condition of a socialistic speaker I went to hear the other night, who in reply to a demand from the audience for a definite statement of his proposed remedies, replied, "We don't know what we want, but we want it right away, and we want it bad." Well, I must confess that these notions of mine have not been very clearly thought out. In the meantime I am unsettled, dissatisfied, miserable. And when I try to answer your question about my future work, I am made more conscious than ever of my wretched intellectual condition. So you must have patience with my heresies and my uncertainties; and perhaps matters will clear up before the time for the final decision comes.

Your affectionate son,

CLARENCE MANSFIELD.

SENIOR PROSPECTS

BRADFORD COLLEGE, January 23, 1905.

MY DEAR FATHER, — I have at last made up my mind what I shall do after graduation, and make haste to tell you first of all. I am going into the mills

with you. I shall make manufacturing my business ; and what time I can spare from business I shall give to politics.

A good stiff course of political economy for the past year and a half has entirely knocked out of me those crude notions about the inherent wickedness of capital, the tyranny of ability, and the sole and exclusive claim of labor to divide among its own hands the entire joint product of the three great agencies. What you told me, too, about your running at a loss during these hard times, has thrown a new light on the matter. I fully appreciate the force of your remark that the problem of industry is not how to divide the spoils, but how to distribute responsibility. I have also gotten over my horror of the trust. I recognize that the increased efficiency of machinery, the cheapening of transportation, the swift transmission of intelligence, the factory system, the massing of population in cities, the concentration of capital in large corporations with extensive plants and enormous fixed charges, the competition of all relatively imperishable and transportable products in one vast world-market have radically changed the conditions of production, and made old-fashioned small-scale production, and free competition between petty competitors, impossible. No, Father ; I don't think you are a robber-baron, because you have joined the trust. I begin to realize the tremendous pres-

sure a corporation is under when it must pay interest, keep up repairs, and meet fixed charges, and can come much nearer meeting these obligations by producing at a loss than by not producing at all. I see that the cutting of prices below cost by old concerns trying to get out of speculative complications, and by new concerns eager to get a footing in the market, makes effective combination an absolute necessity. I see that the trust is simply an effective way of doing what was ineffectively attempted by informal agreements as to trade customs, listings, quotations, and schedules of prices; written agreements limiting output and fixing prices; the appointment of common agents to market the product, and the like. I accept the trust as the stage of economic evolution which the world is now compelled to enter.

So much for business. Now, as to politics. You say that if I am going into business I had better let politics alone. I can't agree with you. What you say about the difficulties, discouragements, and disadvantages of meddling with politics I know to be true. But I am not going into it for what I can get out of it, but for what I can put into it. You may be right in saying that I shall find it impossible in the cold, hard world of fact to make all my fine ideals real. Well, if I can't make the ideal real, I can at least do something toward making the real a little more ideal.

Through a corrupt civil service, honeycombed with sinecures and loaded with incompetence; through valuable franchises, given away, or sold for a song, or bought by bribery; through the sacrifice of efficient municipal administration to the supposed exigencies of national politics; through discriminating legislation, wasteful expenditure, and unnecessary taxation; through the universal failure to find a satisfactory method of dealing with the liquor problem, the poor man is squeezed, and gouged, and plundered by idle office-holders, and fat contractors, and favored corporations, and sleek saloon-keepers, and bribe-taking bosses, and unrighteous rings.

I am going into politics to fight these concrete evils. I am not going to try to do the workingman's work for him. I don't believe he really wants anybody to do that. And I am sure that it would be the worst thing that could happen to him, if he did. But I am going to try to give him a chance to do his work under fair conditions; and make it impossible for pensioners or politicians, directly or indirectly, to take a penny of his hard earnings from him without giving him a penny's worth of commodities or services in return. And as for trusts and corporations which derive their existence and protection from the State, I propose to do my utmost to enforce on them publicity, and the responsibility that goes therewith. I would have their

books open to the best expert accountants the State could employ ; and I would have some way of finding out how much of the vast saving in production these enormous aggregations of capital undoubtedly effect goes to the proprietors, and how much goes to the community.

There, Father, you have my programme : Through business to earn an honest living for myself, and through politics to help every other man to a fair chance to do the same.

In these ways, my views on the relations of capital and labor have undergone a pretty radical change. I could not tell you the whole story in a letter. But suffice it to say : While I still believe that there are grave defects in the existing industrial system, and believe that there are many ways in which it might be improved, I see that such improvement must be a long, slow process of evolution, in which one defect after another must be sloughed off gradually. I see that such a desire to improve the system, and gradually to substitute better features in place of those which now exist, is not inconsistent with one's working practically under the system as it is. Indeed, I am convinced that the desired improvement must come, not through agitators, who seek to apply abstract principles from without, but through manufacturers and merchants, who understand the present system in its practical internal workings, and are thus able

to develop the new out of the old. I believe that my proper place as a reformer is inside, not outside, of the industrial system that is to be reformed.

That is the extent of the socialism there is left in me. At the same time I feel that the strong dose of socialism I have taken during the past year or more has done me good. Unless I had been through this stage of striving to set all things right, I am afraid I should have settled down into the conventional ruts of the mere business man, who is content to make his own little pile in his own way, leaving society to take care of its own affairs. I am glad that my choice of business coincides with your long-cherished wishes; and I hope that you will see that my political purposes are not altogether destitute of justice and sound sense.

Your affectionate son,

CLARENCE MANSFIELD.

BRADFORD COLLEGE, March 2, 1905.

MY DEAR MOTHER, — You already know, from my letter to Father, my final decision about a profession. I am glad it pleases him, and my only regret is that it may not be equally acceptable to you. I know you hoped I should be a minister, or at least a doctor or lawyer. I recognize the many attractive things about all these professions; but I do not believe I was cut out for either of them. If you will pardon once more an illustration

from your chief abomination, the foot-ball field, I can show you how I feel about it. Business and politics seem to me like being actually in the game, playing it for all you are worth. The lawyer strikes me as a sort of umpire, to declare and apply the rules in case of fraud or foul play, or the member of the athletic committee who conducts the diplomacy. The doctor strikes me as the fellow who stands along the side lines, ready to bind up the bruised heads and broken limbs. The journalist is the man who takes notes and writes it up afterward. The minister seems like the man who sits on the grand stand and explains the fine plays and errors to the ladies. My heart would not be in any of these things, and consequently I should not do either of them well. The studies of the last part of the course, now that they are elective, and one carries them far enough to really get into them, sift men out for the right professions, without their knowing when or how it happens.

The fellows that take to biology, that are handy with the microtome and the microscope, go on into medicine as a matter of course. The fellows that get waked up in philosophy, and take the problems of the universe upon their shoulders, naturally go into the ministry. The men that take to history and political science are foreordained to law. Now, while I have been interested in three or four lines, my only genuine enthusiasm has been economics.

Industry and commerce seem to me the basis on which everything else rests. I think that I can do more good as a business man and an active force in politics, with a successful business behind me, than in any other way. The business man and the politician seem to me to be dealing with the real things, while the professional men seem to be dealing only with the symbols of things.

A man's vocation ought to be the expression of his ideal. My ideal is to be an effective member of the social order that now is, and an efficient promoter of the better social order that is to be.

You complain that I do not say much about religion nowadays. As I have told you often, religion is not to my mind an external form superimposed upon life from without, but is the informing spirit of life itself. In striving to do with my might the thing my fellow-men need most to have done for them, I feel that I am at the same time doing what is most acceptable to God, and most conformable to the teaching and example of Jesus Christ.

At the same time I have gotten over that antipathy to religious institutions which I have had for a year or two. I have gone back to the Christian Association here in college ; and whether the change is in them or in me I don't know, but I find myself able both to do good and to get good in their meetings. In fact, unless there were some such meeting-ground for the expression and cultivation

of our ideals, I don't see how they could be kept from fading out. It is a great help to feel that in spite of the diversity of taste, talent, and vocation, so many earnest fellows are going out into the world as sincere servants of the one God, followers of the one Lord, and workers in the one Spirit.

I shall also connect myself actively with the Church. I do not profess to have solved all the problems of theology, and fortunately our Church does not require of laymen like me subscription to an elaborate creed. I see that the cry "Back to Jesus" in religion, is as foolish as the cry "Back to Phidias" in art, or "Back to Homer" in poetry.

We cannot go back to primitive simplicity and naïveté in any department of life. The subsequent development is part and parcel of our spiritual inheritance, of which it is impossible to divest ourselves. The Church, as the organized, institutional expression of the life of the Spirit of God in the heart of humanity, I accept as a spiritual necessity. And I should no more think of trying to serve God and my fellow-men apart from it, than I should think of shouldering my individual musket and marching across the fields on my own private account to defend my country against an invading army. Christian kindness, Christian justice, Christian civilization, Christian culture, the Christian family, and above all a Christian mother like you, I believe in and love with all my heart. And

now that the Church has come to represent to my mind, symbolically at least, all these most precious and beneficent influences that have entered into the structure of my character and life, I cannot do less than freely give my influence and support to the institution from which, indirectly if not directly, I have freely received so much.

So, my dear mother, if you will look beneath the outward form to the underlying spirit, I hope you will see that after all I am a good deal of a Christian; and mean to be in my own way something of a minister too.

Your affectionate son,

CLARENCE MANSFIELD.

BRADFORD COLLEGE, June 15, 1905.

MY DEAREST NELL, — You should n't complain that my letters for the past six weeks have been all about you, and nothing about myself. How can a fellow help it, when you have made him the happiest being in the world? Still, if you command, I must obey, and begin the story of my poor self where I left off. Let's see. Where was it? It seems so long ago and so far away that I can scarce recall it.

“How soon a smile of God can change the world!”

Oh! I remember. The agreement was that you were to quit the rôle of St. Catherine, and conde-

scend to enter a home instead of a settlement ; and I was to abjure the vows of a St. Christopher to right at once all the wrongs of the universe by my own right arm, before entertaining the "thought of tender happiness." We were two precious fools, were n't we? Yet it was a divine folly after all. Goethe is right in his doctrine of renunciation. If we had not faced fairly the giving up of all this bliss, it would not be half so sweet to us now. And please don't tell me I have "smashed at one blow all your long-cherished ideals of social service." It is not so. The substance of all those social aims of yours is as precious to us both as it ever was, and we will find ways to work them out together. Not one jot or tittle of the loftiest standard you ever set before yourself shall be suffered to pass away unfulfilled. Your aims and aspirations are not lost, but transformed, *aufgehoben*, as the Germans say of the chemical constituents of the soil when they are taken up to form the living tissue of plant or animal.

There is nothing you ever thought of doing in a settlement that we will not do better in our home. We shall not give less to the world, because we are more ourselves. We shall not be less able to comfort those who sorrow, because our own hearts overflow with joy. Because we are rich in each other, we shall not be less generous to all. You shall have all the classes and schools and clubs and

meetings you wish ; and they will not be the least bit less successful for being in the home of a mill-owner in our native city of fifty thousand people, instead of in some neglected quarter of a city ten times as big.

Do you know, Father is so delighted with what he calls the "recovery of my reason," that he has promised to build a house for us this fall. We will work up the plans together this summer. One feature of it, though, I have fixed on already, which I know you will approve. Our library will be a long room, with a big fireplace on one side and a cosy den at each end, marked off by an arch supported by pillars. These dens we will fit up with our college books and furniture, and make them just as nearly like our college rooms as we can. And then in the long winter evenings we will come out of our dens before the fireplace ; and you will be my private tutor, and with your patient tuition I shall perhaps get some good after all out of the Horace and Goethe and Shelley and Browning, which you understand and love so well ; but which, to tell the truth, I have n't got much out of thus far. Somehow we fellows don't get hold of those things as you do.

Is n't it glorious that my examinations come so that I can get off for your class day and commencement ! To be sure, I shall probably forget the fine points in political economy and sociology,

in which I have been working for honors the past two years. But then, honors or no honors, I have got the good out of them anyway; and what are honors at the end of college compared with love at the beginning of life?

I am delighted that you are coming to my commencement. My part is a dry, heavy thing, which I don't expect to make interesting to anybody else; but it is intensely interesting to me, for it sums up the inner experience which I have been going through these past four years, and has helped to give me my bearings as I go out into life. My subject is, "Naturalness, Selfishness, Self-sacrifice, and Self-realization." You who have known me as no one else has all these years, you will see what it all means. You catch the idea.

First: We set out as nature has formed and tradition has fashioned us; innocent, susceptible, frail. The hard, cruel world comes down upon us, and would crush us under its heavy unintelligible weight.

Second: We rise up against it, defy tradition and throw convention to the winds. We in turn strive to trample others under foot. But though we wear spiked shoes, we find the pricks we kick against harder and sharper than our spikes.

Third: We surrender, abjectly and unconditionally; cast spear and shield away in the extreme of formal, abstract self-denial, and ascetic, egotis-

tical self-sacrifice. This in turn betrays its hollowness and emptiness and uselessness and unreality.

Fourth: The Lord of life, against whom we've been blindly fighting all the while, lifts us up in his strong arms; sets us about the concrete duties of our station; arms us with the strength of definite human duties, and cheers us with the warmth of individual human love; and sends us forth to the social service which to hearts thus fortified is perfect freedom and perennial delight.

Such a process of spiritual transformation I take to be the true significance of a college course. To be sure in college, as in the great world of which it is a part, none see the meaning of the earlier phases until they reach the later; and consequently many never see any sense in it at all. For the great majority of men go through college, as the great majority go through life, without getting beyond the first or second stage, and graduate as Matthew Arnold says most men die, "Unfreed, having seen nothing, still unblest."

There, Nell, have n't I been as egoistic this time as your altruistic highness could desire?

Your devoted lover,

CLARENCE MANSFIELD.

III

Greek Qualities in the College Man

WHETHER in Cuba or in the Klondike, in camp or in college, wherever men live together in close quarters, there they form a moral code.

The codes of college students, like the codes of mining camps, are couched in grotesque, slangy terms ; but the heart of them is sure to be sound.

For the strictly limited purposes of a college code — that is, for healthy, wealthy young fellows who have no immediate concern about earning their living, and who are free from domestic, business, and political responsibilities — these college codes serve fairly well. That our college youth, in entire unconsciousness of what they are doing, and without the remotest intention of drawing up a moral code, come to a tacit acceptance of principles so profound, so searching, and so comprehensive, is a magnificent witness to the soundness of young men's ethical insight.

The Greeks worked out an ethical code for themselves in as direct a contact with actual social needs as is felt by our miners and soldiers and ranchmen and college students. Though there were many

points which their code did not cover, yet it was much broader than any of these special codes which are being developed to-day, and with adequate amplification can be made to include the whole social duty of man. Their ethical efforts came to so little, not from lack of insight so much as from lack of motive. To unite the ethical insight of the Greek with the spiritual motive of the Christian would be the salvation of individual or country or race.

If we are to see life with the eyes of the Greeks, we must first free our minds of the notion that anything in the world, any appetite or passion of man, is either good or bad in itself. Life would be simple indeed if only some things, like eating and studying and working and saving and giving, were absolutely good; and other things, like drinking and smoking and spending and theatre-going and dancing and sexual love, were absolutely bad. To be sure, men and schools and churches have often tried to dissect life into these two halves; but it never works well. Material things and natural appetites are in themselves neither good nor bad; they become good when rightly related, and bad when wrongly related.

WISDOM IN INVESTMENT

The first Greek virtue is wisdom. Wisdom, in the ethical sense of the term, is a very different thing from book-learning. Illiterate people are frequently exceedingly wise, while learned people are

often the biggest fools. Wisdom is the sense of proportion — the power to see clearly one's ends, and their relative worth ; to subordinate lower ends to higher without sacrificing the lower altogether ; and to select the appropriate means to one's ends, taking just so much of the means as will best serve the ends, — no more and no less. It is neither the gratification nor the suppression of appetite and passion as such, but the organization of them into a hierarchy of ends which they are sternly compelled to subserve.

Of the many ends at which a wise man aims, such as health, wealth, reputation, power, culture, and the like, a single subordinate phase of a single end, the investment of savings, will bring out the essential feature of wisdom. Now, the end at which a man aims in investment of savings is provision for himself and his family in old age. It is the part of wisdom to keep that end constantly before the mind — not allowing other ends to be substituted for it ; and to choose the means which strictly subserve that end — not the means which are attractive in themselves, or promise to serve some other end. Yet simple as this matter is, not one investor of savings in twenty has the wisdom to do it.

Investment of savings is an entirely different thing from the investment a merchant or manufacturer makes for purposes of profit ; and to keep this distinction clear is one of the greatest signs of

practical wisdom. The prime consideration in investment of savings should be security. The wise investor of savings will remember two principles: first, high interest is another name for poor security; second, large profits is another name for extreme risk. He will confine his investment to building and loan associations, savings banks, government and conservative municipal bonds, real estate; first mortgages on real estate worth twice the face of the mortgage, which is producing income considerably in excess of the interest on the mortgage, and is owned by some one who has other property besides that on which the mortgage is held; and finally, local companies which serve essential local needs, like light, water, and transportation, provided they are honestly and economically managed. These, in about the order named, are the only safe and therefore the only wise forms of investment for savings. The expert banker and financier may seek larger profits where he pleases; but the man who puts his savings, be they small or large, on which he relies for old age, into any forms of investment more risky than these is a fool. There is nothing more pitiful than to see men and women, who have worked hard and lived close year after year, flattered and wheedled into putting their savings into some specious scheme which promises six or eight per cent interest, or the chance in a few years to double their money, and then fails altogether just

when the money they have saved is most needed, and the power to earn wages or salary has gone.

To sum up the dictates of wisdom on this point in a few simple rules, wisdom says: "Avoid high rates of interest; seek no business profits beyond the range of your own immediate and expert observation; lend money as a favor to no one, unless you are able and willing, if need be, to give the money outright; have no business dealings with your relatives in which business and sentiment are mixed up; sign no notes and assume no financial responsibilities for other people; keep your money where you can watch the men who manage it for you; never put a large part of your savings into any one investment." He who keeps these rules may not grow suddenly rich, but he will never become suddenly and sorrowfully poor.

This simple yet very practical example may serve as the type of all wisdom. It simply demands that we be perfectly clear about our ends, and the part they play in our permanent plan of life; and then, that we never leave or forsake these chosen ends to chase after others which circumstance or flattery or vanity or indolence or ambition may chance to suggest.

JUSTICE AND MODERN STEALING

If man dwelt alone in the world of things, wisdom to subordinate things to his ends would be

the principal virtue. The form of the perfect character would be a circle, with self as the centre. The fact that we live in a social world, where other persons must be recognized, is the ground of justice, the second Greek virtue. Justice requires the subordination of the interests of the individual to the interests of society, and the persons who constitute society, in the same way that wisdom requires the subordination of particular desires to the permanent interests of the whole individual to whom they belong. For the individual is a part of society in the same vital way in which a single desire is part of an individual. To indulge a single desire at the expense of the permanent self is folly ; and to indulge a single individual, whether myself or another, at the expense of society is injustice.

The essence of injustice consists in treating people, not as persons, having interests and ends of their own, but as mere tools or machines, to do the things we want to have done. The penalty of injustice is a hardening of heart and shriveling of soul ; so that if a person were to treat everybody in that way, he would come to dwell in a world of things, and, before he knew it, degenerate into a mere thing himself. Lord Rosebery points out that this habit of treating men as mere means to his own ends was what made Napoleon's mind lose its sanity of judgment, and made his heart the friendless, cheerless desolation that it was in his last days.

We have all seen persons in whom this hardening, shriveling, drying-up process had reached almost the vanishing-point. The employer toward his "hands;" the officer toward his troops; the teacher, even, toward his scholars; the housekeeper toward her servants; all of us toward the people who cook our food, and make our beds, and sell our meat, and raise our vegetables, are in imminent danger of slipping down on to this immoral level of treating them as mere machines. Royce, in his "Religious Aspect of Philosophy," has set this forth most forcibly among English writers; though it lies at the heart of all German formulas, like Kant's "Treat humanity, whether in thyself or in others, always as an end, never as a means," and Hegel's "Be a person, and respect the personality of others." Royce says: "Let one look over the range of his bare acquaintanceship; let him leave out his friends, and the people in whom he takes a special personal interest; let him regard the rest of his world of fellow-men, — his butcher, his grocer, the policeman that patrols his street, the newsboy, the servant in his kitchen, his business rivals. Are they not one and all to him *ways of behavior* toward himself or other people, outwardly effective beings, rather than realized masses of genuine inner sentiment, of love, or of felt desire? Does he not naturally think of each of them rather as a way of outward action than as a way of inner volition? His butcher, his news-

boy, his servant, — are they not for him industrious or lazy, honest or deceitful, polite or uncivil, useful or useless people, rather than self-conscious people? Is any one of these alive for him in the full sense, — sentient, emotional, and otherwise like himself, as perhaps his own son, or his own mother or wife, seems to him to be? Is it not rather their being for him, not for themselves, that he considers in all his ordinary life? Not their inner volitional nature is realized, but their manner of outward activity. Such is the nature and ground of the illusion of selfishness.”

This passage from Royce lays bare the source of the greater part of the social immorality in the world, and accounts for nine tenths of all the world's trouble.

What wonder that a man of this type cannot succeed in any large work of administration! He treats men as things. But men are not things. They rise up in indignation against him. Every man of them is instantly his enemy, and will take the first chance that occurs to betray him and cast him down. A man of that type cannot run a mill or a store or a school or a political campaign or a hotel a week without being in a row. He cannot live in a community six weeks without having made more enemies than friends. The first time he trips, every one is ready to jump on him. And in all his trouble and unpopularity, and failure and defeat, the beauty

of it is that he is getting precisely what he deserves, and we all exclaim, "It's good enough for him!" Selfishness is closely akin to folly. The fool treats things as if they were mere qualities, and had no permanent effect. But the effects come back to plague and torment him. The selfish man treats men as if they were mere acts, and had no permanent selves. He may at the time get out of them the act he wants, but in doing so he makes them his enemies; and no man can permanently prosper with every other man openly or secretly arrayed against him. The most fundamental question a man can ask about our character is whether and to what extent we habitually treat persons as persons, and not as things. The answer to that question will tell us whether we shall succeed or fail in any enterprise which has an important social side; will tell whether we shall make a home happy or wretched; will tell whether we are more of a blessing or a curse to the world in which we move. And the test is to be found, not in our attitude toward the people whom we consider our superiors and equals; not in the appearance we make in what is technically called society. There we have to be decent, whether we want to or not; there we have to treat, or appear to treat, persons as persons, not as things. Little credit belongs to us for all that. But when it comes to our relations with the people of whom Royce was speaking, there we seem to be under no such social

compulsion. There our real character gets blurred out. How do we think and feel and speak and act toward our washerwoman or the man who does our humblest work for us? That determines whether we are at heart Christians or barbarians, whether a gentleman or a brute sits on the throne of our soul. For whether a fellow-man is ever a means instead of an end, whether the personality of the humblest ever fails to win our recognition, inasmuch as we do it or do it not unto the least of our brethren, determines our moral and social status, as the men of insight, like Kant and Hegel and Jesus, define it.

One of the most important forms of justice is honesty in services and material goods. To be honest means that we refuse to be partner to a trade or transaction in which we would not willingly accept its consequence to all parties, provided we were in their places. Any transaction that involves effects on another we would not willingly, under the circumstances, accept for ourselves, is fraud and robbery. The man who pilfers goods from a pocket or a counter is the least of the thieves of to-day. He is only doing, in a pitiful way, the devil's retail business. The men who do his wholesale business often move in the best of society, and are even the makers and executors of our laws. Wholesale stealing has numerous forms, but it is nearly all reducible to two well-marked types.

First, stealing is carried on by issuing representations of what does not exist as represented. Stealing of this sort is really lying. Adulteration of goods, watered stock, false accounts, are the grosser forms of this stealing. The more adroit of these rascals, however, take to the promotion of spurious enterprises. They form a company to work a mine which has ore, but which they know cannot be worked at a profit; or they build a railroad between points where there is not traffic or travel enough to pay a fair rate of interest on the capital invested. They appropriate to themselves a generous block of the stock as the price for their work of organization. They put in the most expensive plant and equipment. For the first few months, when there are no repairs needed, by artificial stimulus and by various devices of book-keeping, or by leaving some bills unpaid, they make a showing on paper of large earnings above running expenses. On this fictitious showing they sell their stock to investors at a distance, who think they are being specially favored in being let into a chance to earn dividends of ten per cent. Then comes the crash; the poor fools that invested in the stock find it worthless, and even the bonds which represent its construction fall below par. Then the poor robbed, cheated, deluded investors look to the promoter for redress; and lo! he has unloaded his stock, and is planning another

mine in inaccessible Tennessee mountains, or selling lumber that no team can haul out of some impenetrable Florida swamp, or booming city lots staked out on some unbroken Kansas prairie, or running an electric railroad through the pastures and woodlands that connect out-of-the-way hamlets in Maine. Justice and honesty demand that we shall read that man's character in the light of the losses he inflicts on hard-working farmers, dependent widows, poor men and women who have toiled all their lives, and are looking for rest in old age. In that clear light of consequence to their fellows, the acts of these unscrupulous promoters stand out in their naked hideousness and deformity. The man who promotes a scheme of this kind, knowing or having good reason to believe that his gain is represented by widespread robbery of the innocent, and plunder of the unprotected, is a thief and a robber; and the place where he belongs is at hard work in striped clothes, by the side of the defaulter, the burglar, and the picker of pockets. The fact that he does not get there, but fares sumptuously in a palace he rears with his ill-gotten gain, is one of the chief reasons why men still believe and hope there is a hell.

The other type of stealing which flourishes in modern conditions is the misuse of one's representative or delegated influence. A thief of this sort uses his position in one corporation to let

favorable contracts to himself in another corporation in which he is directly or indirectly concerned. He uses his position as purchasing or selling agent for a company by which he is employed, to induce the seller or buyer to make a special rebate or bonus to him in his private capacity; thus charging his employer with an unrecognized salary in addition to the one he is supposed to receive. He uses his political influence to promote his personal fortunes, or those of his friends and retainers, at the public expense. Wherever a representative or delegated power is used for personal, private, friendly, family, or any ends whatever other than the single interests of the constituents or firm or institution represented, there is a case of wholesale stealing of the second type.

Opportunities for the successful practice of these two types of wholesale stealing are incidental to our highly complex political and industrial life. Exceptional talent and industry and enterprise may still manage to make money without them. But most of the great fortunes which are rapidly made rest on one or the other of these two types of theft. The temptations to resort to them in these days are tremendous. Yet it is no new discovery that wrongdoing is profitable and easy, while virtue is costly and hard. The first step toward righteousness in these matters is to define clearly, in modern terms, what honesty is; and to brand all whose

gains rest on the losses of others as the thieves and villains they are.

Justice, if left to the feeble hands of individuals, would be but poorly executed, even if the individuals concerned were most justly and generously disposed. It is through institutions that justice most effectively works. Loyalty to institutions is a higher and more universal form of justice.

Loyalty to the family involves the recognition that the family is prior to the individual. Into the family we are born ; by our parents we are trained and reared ; from parents, brothers, and sisters we first learn life's most precious lesson of love. The loyal son must ever hold the family as a dearer and better self. Its interest must be his interest ; its requirements, his will ; its members, members of himself, to be honored, cherished, defended, supported, so long as he has strength and means to support them, heart and soul wherewith to love.

Loyalty to one's own home carries with it, as its counterpart, a respect for the home and family life of others. Chastity is the great virtue that guards the sanctity of the home. Approached from the point of view of the family and the home, chastity is one of the most reasonable and imperative requirements which justice and loyalty lay upon men. To the libertine justice puts the searching questions : " How would you like to have been born as the product of the passing passion of a man who

was too mean to acknowledge either you or your mother? How would you like to have your own sisters treated in that way? How would you like to look forward to rearing your own daughters for the brief, bitter life of the brothel?" These are hard questions, no doubt, the very suggestion of which gives one a feeling of horror. But just those questions the libertine must answer before he can ever think guiltlessly of a licentious life for himself. For these wretched women whom he meets on the street after nightfall, or goes to a brothel to find, were once the dear daughters and sisters of fond fathers and mothers and brothers; and God meant them to be the happy wives of good husbands, fond mothers of sweet children to grow up and honor and love them in turn. To lead one such woman astray, or to patronize an institution which ruins such women by the wholesale, is to be a traitor to the great and blessed institution of home; to make impossible for others that pure, sweet family life to which we owe all that is best in our own lives, and which holds in its beneficent keeping all the best gifts we can hope to hand down to our children. Chastity is no mere conventional virtue, which a young man may lightly ignore, under some such pretext as "sowing wild oats." It is rooted and grounded in justice to others, and loyalty to the benign institution of home.

THE COURAGE OF SPACE AND TIME

If man were merely a mind, wisdom to see particular desires in the light of their permanent consequences to self, and justice to weigh the interests of self to the impartial scales of a due regard for the interests of others, would together sum up all virtue. Knowledge, in these two forms, would be virtue, as Socrates taught.

We feel, however, as well as know. Nature, for purposes of her own, has placed the premium of pleasure on the exercise of function, and attached the penalty of pain to both privation of such exercise, on the one hand, and over-exertion, on the other. Nature, too, has adjusted the scale of intensity of pleasures and pains to her own ends; placing the keenest rewards and the severest penalties on those appetites which, like nutrition and reproduction, are most essential to the survival of the individual and the race; thus enforcing by her rough process of natural selection a crude wisdom and justice of her own. Moreover, these premiums and penalties were adjusted to the needs of the race at a stage of evolution when scanty and precarious food-supply and a high death-rate, due to the combined inroads of war, famine, and pestilence, rendered nutrition and reproduction of vastly more relative urgency, in comparison with other interests, than they are to-day.

Pleasure and pain, therefore, though reliable guides in the life of an animal struggling for existence, are not reliable guides for men in times of artificial plenty and elaborate civilization. To follow the strongest appetites, to seek the intensest pleasures and shun the sharpest pains, is simply to revert to a lower stage of evolution, and live the life of a beast. Hence that combat of the moral nature with the cosmic process to which Mr. Huxley recently recalled our attention ; or rather, that combat of man with himself which Paul and Augustine, Plato and Hegel have more profoundly expressed. This fact that Nature's premiums and penalties are distributed on an entirely different principle from that which wisdom and justice mark out for the civilized man renders it necessary for wisdom and justice to summon to their aid two subordinate virtues, courage and temperance, — courage to endure the pains which the pursuit of wisdom and justice involves ; temperance to cut off the pleasures which are inconsistent with the ends which wisdom and justice set before us.

The wide, permanent ends at which justice and wisdom aim often involve what is in itself, and for the present, disagreeable and painful. The acquisition of a competence involves hard work, when Nature calls for rest ; the solution of a problem requires us to be wide awake, when Nature urges sleep ; the advocacy of a reform involves unpop-

ularity, when Nature suggests the advantages of having the good opinion of our fellows; the life of the country calls for the death of the soldier, when Nature bids him cling to life by running away.

Now, since we are not ascetics, we must admit that *per se* pleasure is preferable to pain. If it were a question between rest and work when weary, between sleep and waking when tired out, between popularity and unpopularity, between life and death, every sensible man would choose the first alternatives as a matter of course. Wisdom and justice, however, see the present and partial pain as part of a wider personal and social good, and order that the pain be endured. True courage, therefore, is simply the executor of the orders of wisdom and justice. The wise and just man, who knows what he wants, and is bound to get it at all costs, is the only man who can be truly brave. For the strength of one's courage is simply the strength of the wise and just aims which he holds. All bravery not thus rooted and grounded in the vision of some larger end to be gained is mere bravado and bluster.

Of the many applications of courage, two of the simplest will suffice for illustration: the courage of space, to take the pains to keep things in order; and the courage of time, to be punctual, or even ahead of the hour, when a hard task has to be done.

Even if our life is a small, sheltered one, even if we have only our house or rooms to look after, things tend to get out of order, to pile themselves up in heaps, to get out of our reach and into each other's way. To leave things in this chaos is both unwise and unjust; for it will trouble us in the future, and trouble the people who have to live with us. Yet it costs pain and effort to attack this chaos and subject it to order. Endurance of pain, in the name of wisdom and justice, to secure order for our own future comfort and the comfort of our family and friends, is courage. On the other hand, to leave things lying in confusion around us; to let alien forces come into our domain and encamp there in insolent defiance of ourselves and our friends, is a shameful confession that things are stronger than we. To be thus conquered by dead material things is as ignominious a defeat as can come to a man. The man who can be conquered by things is a coward in the strict ethical sense of the term; that is, he lacks the strength of will to bear the incidental pains which his personal and social interests put upon him.

The courage of time is punctuality. When there is a hard piece of work to be done, it is pleasanter far to sit at ease for the present, and put off the work. "The thousand nothings of the hour" claim our attention. The coward yields to "their stupefying power," and the great task remains forever

undone. The brave man brushes these conflicting claims into the background, stops his ears until the sirens' voices are silent, stamps on his feelings as though they were snakes in his path, and does the thing *now* which ever after he will rejoice to have done. In these crowded modern days, the only man who "finds time" for great things is the man who takes it by violence from the thousands of petty, local, temporary claims, and makes it serve the ends of wisdom and justice.

There are three places where one may draw the line for getting a piece of work done. One man draws it habitually a few minutes or hours or days after it is due. He is always in distress, and a nuisance to everybody else. There is no dignity in a life that is as perpetually behind its appointments as a tail is in the rear of a dog.

It is very risky — ethically speaking, it is cowardly — to draw the line at the exact date when the work is due; for then one is at the mercy of any accident or interruption that may overtake him at the end of his allotted time. If he is sick or a friend dies, or unforeseen complications arise, he is as badly off as the man who deliberately planned to be late, and almost as much to blame. For a man who leaves the possibility of accident and interruption out of account, and stakes the welfare of himself and of others on such miscalculation, is neither wise nor just; he is reckless rather than brave.

Even if accidents do not come, he is walking on the perilous edge all the time ; his work is done in a fever of haste and anxiety, injurious alike to the quality of the work and the health of the worker.

The man who puts the courage of punctuality into his work will draw the line for finishing a piece of work a safe period inside the time when it is actually due. If one forms the habit and sticks to it, it is no harder to have work done ten days, or at least one day, ahead of time than to finish it at the last allowable minute. Then, if anything happens, it does no harm. This habit will save literary workers an incalculable amount of anxiety and worry. And it is the wear and tear of worry and hurry, not the amount of calm, quiet work, that kills such men before their time.

I am aware that orderliness and punctuality are not usually regarded as forms of courage. But the essential element of all courage is in them, — the power to face a disagreeable present in the interest of desirable permanent ends. They are far more important in modern life than the courage to face bears or bullets. They underlie the more spectacular forms of courage. The man who cannot reduce to order the things that are lying passively about him, and endure the petty pains incidental to doing hard things before the sheer lapse of time forces him to action, is not the man who will be calm and composed when angry mobs are howling about him,

or who will go steadily on his way when greed and corruption, hypocrisy and hate, are arrayed to resist him. For, whether in the quiet of a study and the routine of an office or in the turmoil of a riot or a strike, true courage is the ready and steadfast acceptance of whatever pains are incidental to securing the personal and public ends that are at stake.

TEMPERANCE IN DRUGS

Temperance is closely akin to courage; for as courage takes on the pains which wisdom and justice find incidental to their ends, so temperance cuts off remorselessly whatever pleasures are inconsistent with these ends. The temperate man does not hate pleasure, any more than the brave man loves pain, for its own sake. It is not that he loves pleasure less, but that he loves wisdom and justice more. He puts the satisfaction of his permanent and social self over against the fleeting satisfaction of some isolated appetite, and cuts off the little pleasure to gain the lasting personal and social good. There is a remark of Hegel which gives the key to all true temperance: "In the eye of fate all action is guilt." Since we are finite, to do one thing is to neglect all the competing alternative courses. We cannot have our cake and eat it too. As James puts it: "Not that I would not, if I could, be both handsome and fat and well-dressed and a great athlete, and make a million a year; be a wit, a

bon-vivant, and a lady-killer, as well as a philosopher; a philanthropist, statesman, warrior, and African explorer, as well as a 'tone-poet' and saint. But the thing is simply impossible. The millionaire's work would run counter to the saint's; the *bon-vivant* and the philanthropist would trip each other up; and the philosopher and the lady-killer could not well keep house in the same tenement of clay. So the seeker of his truest, strongest, deepest self must review the list carefully, and pick out the one on which to stake his salvation."

Some selection there must be between competing and mutually exclusive goods. The intemperate man selects what appeals most forcibly to his sensibilities at the moment. The temperate man selects that which best fits his permanent ends. There is sacrifice in either case. The intemperate man sacrifices his permanent and social self to his transient physical sensations. The temperate man sacrifices his transient sensations in the interest of his permanent and social self.

The temptation to intemperance comes chiefly from a false abstraction of pleasure. Finding that some function is attended with pleasure, we perform the function for the sake of the pleasure, forgetting to consider the end at which the function aims, or even disregarding the end altogether. A man seizes on one or another of the more sensitive parts of his nervous system, and then contrives ways

to produce constant or frequently recurrent excitation. Thus the glutton crams his stomach, not for the nourishment and vigor food will give him, but for the sensations of agreeable taste and comfortable distention. Muscle must toil, brain must plan, and every other organ do extra work, simply to give the palate its transient titillation and provide the stomach its periodic gorge. The drunkard gets the whole sympathetic system of nerves into an excitation so intense as to drive away all concern for other things, and fill his consciousness completely full of the glorious sense that all is well with his physical organism. Tobacco gives a pleasure still farther removed from any rational end. With a minimum of physical substance, a man can get the sensation of working his jaws and lungs, secreting saliva, and being in a tranquil state of body and mind.

Yet if one is bound to have agreeable sensations, regardless of their permanent effects, there is a way, quick, sure, cheap, refined, convenient, unobtrusive, far beyond the crude, clumsy devices of glutton, drunkard, snuff-taker, chewer, or smoker. With a powder so small that it can be held on the tip of a penknife, with a tablet a whole bottle of which can be carried in the pocket, with a drop injected by the hypodermic syringe, one may invoke the magic potency of morphine, hashish, or cocaine.

Such are the latest refinements of intemperance, the most improved devices for stimulating our phys-

ical and nervous functions into pleasurable activity, apart from all consideration of the normal ends the functions were evolved to serve. It would be easy to hold them up to ridicule. If, in a book of travels, we were to read of a tribe in some remote island who spent a large portion of their substance gorging themselves with a dozen kinds of food at a single meal; pouring down liquid which made them silly and stupid, and therefore careless and happy; stuffing vegetable matter up their noses, or chewing it and spitting out the juice, or rolling it up in tubes, or putting it in bowls and setting fire to it for the fun of pulling the smoke into their mouths and puffing it out again; or injecting under their skins substances which would make them lose all sense of reality and responsibility, and live in a dream world where wishes were horses and beggars might ride; and if we had never heard of such practices before, we should not rank them very high in the scale of civilization.

Yet we cannot, if we would, dispose of these forms of intemperance by ridicule. In each case some pleasure is gained, and that pleasure is so far forth a real good. Let us be serious and fair with them all.

The glutton's gorging of his stomach, in so far as it produces a pleasurable feeling of distention, is good. If a man were nothing but a stomach, and that were made of cast iron, then gluttony would

be not only good, but the highest good. If a man were nothing but a bundle of nerves, and these were of wire and never subject to reaction, then the man who could keep them thrilling most intensely by whiskey and champagne would be the wisest one of us all. So if man were nothing but a nose, and that had the lining of a boiler, then snuff-taking would be the acme of virtue. If man were reduced to a pair of huge jaws, then chewing would be virtue for him. If one were a heating-plant chimney, then smoking would be the best he could do. If a man need do nothing but dream, then to neglect the joys of opium or cocaine would be superlative folly.

The evil of these things is due to the greater good they displace. Man is more than stomach or nerves or nose or jaws or chimney or dreamer; and indulgence in these departments of his life, unless very carefully controlled and restricted, involves injury to more important sides of life, out of all proportion to the petty gains in these special departments in question.

The folly or evil of these practices differs greatly in degree, though they are all branches from the same psychological root, — the quest of sensations divorced from the normal ends the stimulated functions serve. The list of branches from this same root could easily be enlarged. Theoretically, the highest wisdom, the strictest temperance, would elimi-

nate them all; not, however, on ascetic grounds, but on the rational ground that the wisest man can find better use for his time and money, his vitality and strength, than in any of these abnormally evoked sensations. Yet, practically, something must be conceded to human weakness and infirmity. To say that all these things are theoretically foolish, and therefore immoral, does not carry with it the position that every man is a fool and a knave who practices them. Gluttony, the use of snuff, and chewing, once as prevalent and popular among those who could afford them as smoking is now, have receded before the advancing march of a higher civilization, until they are hardly consistent with our ideas of a gentleman. Drunkenness is rapidly going into the same category. A century ago a man was thought no less a gentleman because he was occasionally or even frequently drunk. Today, a man who permits himself to be seen drunk is not wanted for employee or partner or son-in-law or intimate friend. The victim of drug habits we all pity, loathe, and distrust. Moderate drinking and smoking are the two forms in which the quest for abnormal or non-functional sensation is still in vogue. All the other forms of intemperance cited have so far received the stigma of social disapproval that their gradual descent through lower and lower strata of society to final disuse is merely a question of time.

Moderate drinking and smoking undoubtedly have still a long lease of life. There is a good deal to be said in behalf of them both. Moderate drinking temporarily aids digestion, increases good-fellowship, dispels anxiety and care, and serves one of the two purposes of food. We all know multitudes of men who have practiced it for years, and are apparently little the worse for it. To them its discontinuance would be a real hardship; costing, perhaps, in mental strain and effort and temporary physical discomfort, more than the resulting physical gain to themselves as individuals. That multitudes of people will continue the practice, and will do so under the impression, right or wrong, that they are doing what is wisest and best for themselves, there can be no doubt. Such people are not to be condemned as intemperate. Whatever the final verdict of physiology may be, so long as these people believe on the testimony of expert authorities whose judgment they trust, and on their own experience so far as they are competent to interpret it, that moderation in the use of alcoholic drink is good for them, they are wise and temperate in its use. For morality is not a matter of right or wrong opinion about physiological or social questions. It is a question of personal attitude towards the opinions which one holds.

The man, however, who knows or believes that it injures him, and helps materially to injure others,

and still continues to use it, thereby confesses himself to be a fool and a slave, and merits our severe condemnation. The fundamental elements of manhood are wanting in that man. His rank is lower than the beasts; for they cannot violate a reason they do not possess. Instinct does for them what the consciously intemperate man lacks the 'stamina to do for himself. In view of the doubtful nature of the gain which moderate use of alcoholic liquor brings even to those who interpret temporary exhilaration as permanent benefit; in view of the danger that moderation will slip into excess, and be caught in the chains of habit; in view of the havoc and misery which liquor causes in the world; in view of the extreme difficulty of securing the temperate individual use without complicity in its terrible social abuse; in view of the certainty that in the long run the individual would be quite as well off without it, and that society as a whole would be infinitely the gainer if it were universally discarded as a beverage, — the man who seeks to be guided in his life by the highest wisdom and the sanest temperance, though he have not a particle of asceticism in his make-up, though he grudge no man the joy he gets from a social glass, though he will judge no man who conscientiously uses it as either morally or spiritually inferior to himself in consequence, yet, in the present state of physiological knowledge and the existing social conditions that

attend the use of alcoholic drinks as a beverage, will find the better part for himself and the highest service to society in a moderation so strict as to amount to practical abstinence.

Smoking, so easily disposed of on ascetic principles, presents, from our point of view, a very difficult and delicate question. There is a good deal to be said in its behalf. It is a solace of solitude. It is a substitute for exercise. It promotes digestion. It brings people together on terms of easy and restful intimacy; taking away the chill and stiffness from social intercourse, much as an open fire in the fireplace adds a cheer to a room, quite independent of the warmth it generates. The advantages from smoking are not confined exclusively to the immediate physical sensation.

Futhermore, when once the habit is established, the body adapts itself to it, and contrives, through lungs, skin, and kidneys, — though not without scenting the clothing with foul exhalations, and tainting the breath with offensive odors, — to throw the poison off. Hence men who have once formed the habit; who feel that they can afford its considerable expense, and can find no better use for the money it represents; who gain a good deal of pleasure from it, and are able to detect no serious physical effects, may well believe (although, if they were to look the matter up impartially, the weight of scientific testimony would be against them) that,

on the whole, for them, situated as they are, the continuance of the habit represents the greater good. Here, again, it is not for us to judge individuals. All we can say is that this is a possible, if not the impartial and scientific way of looking at the matter. Many do look at it in that light. In so far as they are honest in taking that view of the matter, they are wise and temperate in smoking as they do. If, however, they know it is injuring them; if they have a sneaking suspicion, which they dare not follow up with a thorough investigation, that the practice is injurious in general, and is harming themselves in particular, then they are fools and slaves to persist in the practice. But that is a judgment which the individual, who alone knows the facts from the inside, must be left to pass upon himself. We who stand on the outside cannot get at the inner facts, and so have no right to pass such a judgment. At all events, the young man who would attune his life to the highest wisdom, and control it by the firmest temperance, will not permit himself to form the habit before he has attained his full physical and mental stature, and has proved his ability with his own hand or brain to earn for himself whatever necessities and comforts of life he believes to be more fundamental and important than the inhalation and exhalation of smoke.

Let us be careful not to confound a wise temper-

ance with the absurdities and rigors of asceticism. Asceticism hates pleasure, and sets itself up as something superior to pleasure. Hence it is sour, narrow, repulsive. As Macaulay said of the Puritans, "They hated bear-baiting, not because it gave pain to the bear, but because it gave pleasure to the spectators ;" so the ascetic seems to hate the pleasure there is in things, and to begrudge other people their joys and consolations. Temperance work has too often fallen into the hands of these ascetic cranks, who pose as the apostles and martyrs of the true and only temperance.

True temperance is modest. It is nothing in itself, but, like courage, simply the handmaid of wisdom and justice to carry out their commands. Temperance does not hate pleasure. Temperance loves pleasure more wisely — that is all. The temperate man recognizes that the pleasure of an act is a pretty sure indication that the act has some elements of good. But temperance denies that pleasure is an indication of the relative worth of different acts. Reason, not pleasure alone, must decide that point. Temperance never cuts off an indulgence, unless it be to save some greater and more valuable interest of life. Temperance is always, if it is modest, and keeps its proper place as the handmaid of wisdom, engaged in cutting off a lesser to save a greater good. Its weapon and symbol is the pruning-knife ; and its aim and justi-

fication is that the vine of life may bear more and better fruit. To erect temperance into a positive principle, to be merely a temperance man or woman, to cut off the fair leaves of pleasure merely for the sake of cutting them off, is monstrous, unnatural, perverse. The great moral motive power of life must lie in the positive and pleasurable interests which wisdom and justice and faith and love lay hold upon. To cast out evil as an end in itself is as futile as to try to drive the air out of a room with a fan.

Temperance, indeed, often finds itself arrayed against the lower and intenser forms of pleasure. That is because, for purposes of her own, Nature has attached the keenest pleasure to those instincts which are most fundamental to the preservation of the individual and the perpetuation of the species. But temperance, if it be wise, — if, that is, it be truly moral, — must ever justify itself by those personal and social goods at which wisdom and justice aim. Hence temperance, though an important virtue in its place, is yet a strictly subordinate one. No man can amount to much without constant practice of stern self-denial and rigid self-control. But a man who does nothing but that; the man who erects temperance into a positive principle, who believes that the pruning-knife can bear fruit of itself, and despises the rich soil that feeds the roots and the sweet sap that nourishes

the branches of the vine of life, is no man at all. The measure and value of our temperance is, not the indulgences which we lop off from the branches of life here and there, but the beauty and sweetness and worth of the fruit which is borne by our lives as a whole.

Such are the counsels a Greek philosopher would give us, could he return to earth to-day. Would give, I say ; for I am well aware that the points I have chosen for illustration are, for the most part, points on which Plato and Aristotle touched very lightly, if at all ; and that on the most important of them their precept and practice were in open contradiction to the precepts I here have set forth. I have followed the logic of their principles rather than the letter of their precepts. Like a fluid in connected vessels, the spiritual life of an age cannot rise, in its ethical precept and practice, above the level of the prevailing religious conceptions, literary standards, political institutions, and social customs. No one knew this better than Plato, as is evident from his attack on the current literary and religious standards of his day, and his attempt to construct an ideal republic, where philosophers should be kings. Christianity, democracy, and the deepening recognition of the rights of personality in men and women, children and servants, have lifted the level of spiritual life to heights undreamed of by Plato,

•

and pronounced by Aristotle to be impossible. On this higher level, the old formulas of the Greeks receive a vastly richer content and an infinitely wider application ; but as forms of statement they never have been and never will be surpassed.

However deep, and wide, and full man's life, under Christian influence and inspiration, may come to be, it will ever retain the form the old Greeks stamped upon it. Man will ever approach perfection in proportion to the wisdom with which he grasps the permanent ends of his life, and subordinates all means to those ends ; the justice with which he weighs the interests of his fellows in the same scales as his own ; the courage with which he greets all pains incidental to the prosecution of his own ends and those of his fellows ; and the temperance with which he cuts off whatever pleasure proves inconsistent with the steadfast adherence to these personal and social ends. For thus to live a wise, just, brave, temperate life is to be rightly related to the world, to one's fellows, and to one's true self ; and therefore sums up, as far as ethics apart from politics and religion can do it, all the virtues and duties of man.

IV

The Career of Self-Conquest

I. FORESIGHT AND REPENTANCE

SINCE psychology and ethics are partners, ethics is bound to take the first chance to return psychology's lead. As long as psychology put full-fledged faculties of free will and conscience into the soul's original outfit, it was all very well for ethics to respond with inexplicable intuitions and categorical imperatives. Now that psychology is telling us that the will is simply "the sum total of our mental states in so far as they involve attentive guidance of conduct," and its sole sphere of action "the attentive furthering of our interest in one act or desire as against all others present to our minds at the same time," ethics can no longer put us off with cut and dried rules for keeping a fixed, formal self out of mischief, but must show us how, from the raw materials of appetites, passions, and instincts, with the customs, institutions, and ideals of the race for our models, to create, each man for himself, an individuality of ever tightening coherence and ever expanding dimensions.

This twofold task, to preserve the unity of life at the same time that we multiply and magnify the

interests we unify, gives to ethics at once its difficulty and its zest. Either half of this task would be easy and stupid. If unification, simplicity, peace, is our sole aim, we have but to call in the monks and the mystics, the lamas and the mental healers, for a half-dozen lessons and treatments. If, on the other hand, we aim at bulk, complexity, tension, almost any business man, or club woman, or "globetrotter," or debauchee can teach us as much as that. To challenge the simple unity of our habitual lives by every interest that promises enlargement and enrichment, and in turn to challenge each new interest in the name of a singleness of purpose which it may stretch as much as it please, but on no account shall break, — this double task is hard indeed; the zest of this game is great.

In a task so difficult as this of relating ever new materials to each other in the unity of an organic whole, failure is the only roadway to success. For there are ten thousand possible combinations of our appetites, desires, interests, and affections, of which only one precise, definite way can be right, and all the rest must be wrong. As Aristotle learned from the Pythagoreans, virtue is definite or limited; vice is indefinite, or infinite. It is so easy to miss the mark that any fool can be vicious; so hard to hit it that the strongest man's first efforts go astray. "Adam's fall" was foreordained by stronger powers than even the decree of a God. For every son of

Adam, sin, or the missing of the perfect mark, is a psychological necessity. Nothing short of a miracle could prevent a man's first, experimental adjustments of his environment to himself from being the failures they are. For in every art and craft, in every game and sport where skill is involved, the progressive elimination of errors is the only way to a perfection which is ever approximated, but never completely attained.

Yet the difficulty of the moral life is at the same time its glory. For the very source of the difficulty may be turned into a weapon of conquest. The difficulty is all due to the organic connection of experience. If experiences stood alone, disconnected, the moral problem would be simple indeed. Hunger feasting is better than hunger starved; thirst drinking is better than thirst unquenched; weariness resting is better than weariness at work. If the feast, or the drink, or the rest were the only things to be considered, then the gratification of each desire as fast as it arose would be the whole duty of man. None but a fool could err. But, on the other hand, the wise man would be no better off than the fool. There would be no use for his wisdom, no world of morals to conquer.

Foresight is the first great step in this career of moral conquest. The mind within and the world without are parallel streams of close-linked sequences, in which what goes in as present cause

comes out as future effect. This linkage at the same time binds and sets us free. It binds us to the effect, if we take the cause. It sets us free in the effect, if the effect is foreseen, and the cause is chosen with a view to the effect. These streams of sequence repeat themselves. They are reducible to constant types. They can be accepted or rejected as wholes. To accept such a whole, taking an undesirable present cause for the sake of a desirable future effect, is active foresight, or courage. To reject a whole, foregoing a desired present cause in order to escape an undesirable future effect, is passive foresight, or temperance. Foresight reads into present appetite its future meaning; and if backed up by temperance and courage, rejects or accepts the immediate gratification according as its total effect is repugnant or desirable.

It is at this point that vice creeps into life. If virtue is choosing the whole life history, so far as it can be foreseen, in each gratification or repression of a particular desire, vice is the sacrificing of the whole self to a single desire. How is this possible?

Partly through ignorance or lack of foresight. Yet vice due to ignorance is pardonable, and is hardly to be called vice at all. It is sheer stupidity. This, however, which was the explanation of Socrates, lets us off too easily.

Vice is due chiefly to inattention; not ignorance, but thoughtlessness. "I see the better and approve,

yet I pursue the worse." In this case knowledge is not absent, but defective. It is on the margin, not in the focus, of consciousness. In the language of physiological psychology, a present appetite presents its claims on great billows of nerve commotion which come rolling in with all the tang and pungency which are the characteristic marks of immediate peripheral excitation. The future consequences of the gratification of that appetite, on the contrary, are represented by the tiny, faint, feeble waves which flow over from some other brain centre, excited long ago, when the connection of this particular cause with its natural effect was first experienced. In such an unequal contest between powerful vibrations shot swift and straight along the tingling nerves from the seat of immediate peripheral commotion, and the meagre, measured flow of faded impressions whose initial velocity and force were long since spent, what wonder that the remote effect seems dim, vague, and unreal, and that the immediate gratification of the insistent, clamorous appetite or passion wins the day! This is the modern explanation of Aristotle's old problem of incontinence.

Whence, then, comes repentance? From the changed proportions in which acts present themselves to our afterthought. "The tumult and the shouting dies." The appetite, once so urgent and insistent, lies prostrate and exhausted. Its clamorous messages stop. The pleasure it brought dies

down, vanishes into the thin air of memory and symbolical representation, out of which it can only call to us with hollow, ghost-like voice. On the contrary, the effect, whether it be physical pains, or the felt contempt of others, or the sense of our own shame, gets physical reinforcement from without, or invades those cells of the brain where memory of the consequences of this indulgence lie, latent but never dead, and stirs them to the very depths. Now all the vividness and pungency and tang are on their side. They cry out Fool! Shame! Sin! Guilt! Condemnation! Then we wonder how we could have been fools enough to take into our lives such a miserable combination of cause and effect as this has proved to be. The act we did and the act we repent of doing are in one sense the same. But we did it with the attractive cause in the foreground, and the repulsive effect in the background. We repent of the same act with the repulsive effect vivid in the foreground of present consciousness, and the attractive cause in the dim background of memory. Then we vow that we will never admit that combination into our lives again.

Will we keep our vow? That depends on our ability to recall the point of view we gained in the mood of penitence the next time a similar combination presents itself. It will come on as before, with the attractive offer of some immediate good in the foreground, and the unwelcome effect trailing

obscurely in the rear. If we take it as it comes, adding to the presentation no contribution of our own, we shall repeat the folly and vice of the past, — become again the passive slaves of circumstance, the easy prey of appetite and passion, the stupid victims of the serpent's subtlety.

Our freedom, our moral salvation, lies in our power to call up our past experience of penitence and lay this revived picture of the act, with effect in the foreground, on top of the vivid picture which appetite presents. If we succeed in making the picture that we reproduce from within the one which determines our action, we shall act wisely and well. By reflecting often upon the pictures drawn for us in our moments of penitence, by reviving them at intervals when they are not immediately needed, and by forming the habit of always calling them up in moments of temptation, we can give to these pictures, painted by our own penitence, the control of our lives. This is our charter of freedom; and though precept, example, and the experience of others may be called in to supplement our own personal experience, this power to revive the actual or borrowed lessons of repentance is the only freedom we have. Call it memory, attention, foresight, prudence, watchfulness, ideal construction, or what name we please, the secret of our freedom, the key to character, the control of conduct, lies exclusively in this power to force into the foreground considera-

tions which of themselves tend to slip into the background, so that, as in a well-constructed cyclorama, where actual walls and fences join on to painted walls and fences without apparent break, the immediately presented desire, backed up by all the impetus of immediate physical excitation, shall count for precisely its proportionate worth in a representation of the total consequences of which it is the cause.

II. SOCIAL SYMPATHY AND RESPONSIBILITY

If I were the only person in the world, if all the other forces were material things, with no wills of their own, then the single principle of inserting into the stream of sequence the causes which lead to the future I desire for myself, and excluding those of which I have had reason to repent, would be the whole of ethics. Fortunately life is not so simple and monotonous as all that. The world is full of other wills as eager, as interesting, as strenuous, as brave as we, in our best moments, know our own to be. By sympathy, imagination, insight, and affection we can enrich our lives an hundred-fold by making their aims and aspirations, their interests and struggles, their joys and sorrows our own. Not only can we do this, but to some extent we must. It is impossible to live an isolated life, apart from our fellows. Man is by nature social. Alone he becomes inhuman. A life which has no outlet in

sympathy with other lives is unendurable. If men cannot find some one to love, they insist on at least finding some one to quarrel with, or defy, or maltreat, or at least despise. Even hatred and cruelty and pride have this social motive at their heart, and in spite of themselves are witnesses to the essentially social nature of man, and the soul of latent goodness buried beneath the hardest of corrupted and perverted hearts.

Our social nature complicates and at the same time elevates enormously the moral problem. It is no longer a question of dovetailing together the petty fragments of my own little life so as to make their paltry contents a coherent whole ; I now have the harder and more glorious task of making my life as a whole an effective and harmonious element in the larger whole which includes the lives of my fellows and myself. Here again there is a vast task for the imagination to perform ; a more spacious cyclorama for it to construct. Not merely the effects upon myself, but the consequences for as many of my fellows as my act directly and traceably affects, I must now represent. Before I can permit an act to find a place in my present conduct I must foresee, not only what it means for my own future, but for the future of all my neighbors who come within the range of its influence.

For their future is, in proportion to the closeness of the ties that bind us, almost as completely

in my control as it is in their own. Indeed, if I be the stronger person, if I have clear foresight where their prevision is dim, if I grasp firmly aims which they hold but feebly, their future may be even more in my hands than it is in their own. Thus the parent is more responsible for the child's future than is the child himself. The husband often holds the alternative of life or death for his wife in his hands, according as he is patient, forbearing, considerate, and kind, or exacting, inconsiderate, cross, and cruel. The wife, on the other hand, more often holds the future of her husband's character in her hands, making him sober and honest if she is winsome and sincere, driving him to drink if she is slovenly and querulous, leading him into dishonesty if she is extravagant and vain. Every person of any considerable strength of character can recall many an instance in which by a half-hour's conversation, followed up by occasional suggestions afterward, he has changed the whole subsequent career of another person. To one who has discovered the secret of this power, a week permitted to pass by without thus changing the life-currents of half a dozen of his fellows would seem a wicked, wanton waste of life's chief privilege and joy. I could name a quiet, modest man who at a low estimate has changed directly and radically for the better a thousand human lives; and indirectly, to an appreciable degree, certainly not less than a

hundred thousand. He is no professional preacher or evangelist; and the greater part of this vast work has been done in quiet conversation, mainly in his own home, and by correspondence.

Such power of one man over another is in no way inconsistent with the freedom and responsibility of them both. In psychical as in physical causation many antecedents enter into each effect. When I pull the trigger of my shotgun, and by so doing shoot a partridge, I am by no means the only cause of the bird's death. The maker of the powder, the maker of the shot, the man who put them together in the cartridge, the maker of the gun, the dog that helped me find the bird, and countless other forces, which we express in such general terms as the laws of chemistry and physics, enter into the production of the effect. Nevertheless, my pulling the trigger, though not the whole cause, is a real cause. Precisely so when I offer my boy a quarter for shooting a partridge, and under the influence of that inducement he goes hunting, he is just as free in trying to secure the reward as I am in offering it. Both my desire for the partridge, which leads me to offer the prize, and his desire for the quarter are factors in producing the result. We are both free in our acts, and both share responsibility for the shooting of the bird. For that act figured alike in his future and in my future as an element in a desired whole. The same

92 THE CAREER OF SELF-CONQUEST

external fact may enter as an element in the freedom of thousands of persons. A great work of art, for example, is an expression of the freedom not only of the artist who paints or writes, but of all who see or read in it that which they long for and admire. The goods of the will and the spirit, unlike the goods of the mill and the market, are "in widest commonalty spread." They refuse to make objects of exclusive possession. I cannot intensely cherish an idea, or entertain a plan, for which my fellows shall not be either the better or the worse. Every conscious act deliberately chosen and accepted is an act of freedom, and every word or deed goes forth from us freighted with social consequence, and weighted to that precise extent with moral responsibility.

Hence social imagination or sympathy is the second great instrument of morality, as individual imagination or foresight was the first. If our individual salvation is by foresight and repentance, our social salvation is through imagination and love. No logical "reconciliation of egoism and altruism" is possible; for that would involve reducing one of the two elements to terms of the other. Both are facts of human experience, found in every normal life. I live my own life by setting before myself a future, and taking the means that lead thereto. I find this life worth living in proportion to the length and breadth and height of

the aims I set before myself, and the wisdom and skill I bring to bear upon their achievement. But I cannot make my own aims long, wide, or high, without at the same time taking account of the aims of my fellows. I may clash with them, and try to use them as means to my own ends. That leads to strife and bitterness, sorrow and shame. Either my own ends are defeated, if, as is generally the case, my fellows prove stronger than I; or else they are won at such cost of injury to others that in comparison they seem poor and pitiful, not worth the winning. This is the experience of the normal man; and though by pride and hardness of heart one may make shift to endure a comparatively egoistic life, no person can find it so good as never to be haunted by visions of a better, which sympathy and love might bring.

On the other hand, if I generously take into account the aims of my fellow-man, and live in them with the same eagerness with which I live in my own, using for him the same foresight and adaptation of means to ends that I would use for myself, throwing my own resources into the scale of his interests when his resources are inadequate, sharing with him the sorrow of temporary defeat, and the triumph of hard-won victories, I find my own life more than doubled by this share in the life of another. The little that I add to his fore-

sight and strength, if given with sympathy and love, when added to the energy, latent or active, which he already has, works wonders out of all proportion to the results I could achieve in my life alone, or which he alone could achieve in his. Love not merely adds; it multiplies; as in the story of the loaves and fishes. It not only increases; it magnifies the life, alike of him who gives and him who receives. Just why it should do so is hard to explain in purely egoistic terms; as hard as to explain to an oyster why dogs like to run and bark; or to a heap of sand why the particles of a crystal arrange themselves in the wondrous ways they do. It is a simple, ultimate fact of experience that just as a life of individual foresight is on the whole better worth living than the life of hand-to-mouth gratification, so the life of loving sympathy is a life infinitely more blessed than the best success the poor self-centred egoist can ever know. If a selfish life were found on the basis of wide experience and comprehensive generalization to be a more blessed and glorious life than the life of loving sympathy, then the selfish life would be the life we ought to live: precisely as if houses in which the centre of gravity falls outside the base were the most stable and graceful structures men could build, that would be the style of architecture we all "ought" to adopt. Ethics and architecture are both ideal pursuits, in the

sense that they have as their object to make a present ideal plan into a future fact. But both must build their ideals out of the solid facts of past experience. It is just as undeniable, unescapable a fact of ethics that the aim of a noble and blessed life must fall outside its own individual interests, as it is an undeniable, unescapable law of architecture that the centre of gravity of a stable, graceful structure must fall within its base.

Still the appeal to brute fact, though valid, is not ultimate. There is a reason for the fact that structures in which the centre of gravity falls outside the base are unstable; and physics formulates that reason in the law of gravitation. So there is a reason why a selfish life is unsatisfactory; and ethics formulates that reason in the law of love. These facts are so; but they have to be so because they could not find a place in the total system of things if they were otherwise. A universe of consistent egoists would not be a permanent possibility. It could only exist temporarily as a hell in process of its own speedy disruption and dissolution.

Yet just as a man can forget his own future, and in so doing wrong his own soul, a man can be blind to the consequence of his act for his neighbor, and in so doing wrong society and his own social nature. The root of all social sin is this blindness to social consequence. Hence the great

task of sound ethics is to stimulate the social imagination. We must be continually prodding our sense of social consequence to keep it wide awake. We must be asking ourselves at each point of contact with the lives of others such pointed questions as these: How would you like to be this tailor or washerwoman whose bill you have neglected to pay? How would you like to be the customer to whom you are selling these adulterated or inferior goods? How would you like to be the investor in this stock company which you are promoting with water? How would you like to be the taxpayer of the city which you are plundering by lending your official sanction to contracts and deals which make its buildings and supplies and services cost more than any private individual would have to pay? How would you like to be the employer whose time and tools and material you are wasting at every chance you get to loaf and shirk and neglect the duties you are paid to perform? How would you like to be the clerk or saleswoman in the store where you are reaping extra dividends by imposing harder conditions than the state of trade and the market compel you to adopt? How would you like to be the stoker or weaver or mechanic on the wages you pay and the conditions of labor you impose? How would you like to live out the dreary, degraded, outcast future of the woman whom you wantonly ruin for a moment's passionate pleasure?

How would you like to be the man whose good name you injure by slander and false accusation? How would you like to be the business rival whom you deprive of his little all by using your greater wealth in temporary cut-throat competition?

These are the kind of questions the social imagination is asking of us at every turn. There are severe conditions of trade, politics, war, which often compel us to do cruel things and strike hard, crushing blows. For these conditions we are not always individually responsible. The individual who will hold his place, and maintain an effective position in the practical affairs of the world, must repeatedly do the things he hates to do, and file his silent protest, and work for such gradual change of conditions as will make such hard, cruel acts no longer necessary. We must sometimes collect the rent of the poor widow, and exact the task from the sick woman, and pay low wages to the man with a large family, and turn out the well-meaning but inefficient employee. We must resist good men in the interest of better things they cannot see, and discipline children for reasons which they cannot comprehend. Yet even in these cases where we have to sacrifice other people, we must at least feel the sacrifice; we must be as sorry for them as we would be for ourselves if we were in their place. We must not turn out the inefficient employee, unless we would be willing to resign his place our-

selves, if we held it and were in it as inefficient as he. We must not exact the rent or the task from the poor widow or the sick saleswoman, unless on the whole if we were in their places we should be willing to pay the rent or perform the task. Even this principle will not entirely remove hardship, privation, and cruelty from our complex modern life. But it will very greatly reduce it; and it will take out of life what is the cruelest element of it all, — the hardness of human hearts.

To sternly refuse any gain that is purchased by another's loss, or any pleasure bought with another's pain; to make this sensitiveness to the interests of others a living stream, a growing plant within our individual hearts; to challenge every domestic and personal relation, every industrial and business connection, every political and official performance, every social and intellectual aspiration, by this searching test of social consequence to those our act affects, — this is the second stage of the moral life; this is one of the two great commandments of Christianity.

III. AUTHORITY AND PUNISHMENT

To see the whole effect upon ourselves, and upon others, of each act which we perform is the secret of the moral life. Yet we are shortsighted by nature, and often blinded by prejudice and passion. The child at first is scarcely able to see vividly and

clearly beyond the present moment and his individual desires. And in many respects we all remain mere children to the end. Is not the moral task then impossible?

Hard it is indeed. Impossible, too, it would be, if we had no tools to work with; no helps in this hard task. Fortunately we have the needed helps, and they come first in the authority of our parents and rulers. Their wider experience enables them to see what the child cannot see. Their commandments, therefore, if they are wise and good, point in the direction of consequences which the child cannot see at the time, but which, when he does see, he will accept as desirable. An act which leads to an unseen good consequence, done in obedience to trusted authority or respected law, is right. The person who does such an act is righteous. And the righteousness of it rests on faith,—faith in the goodness and wisdom of the person he obeys. Righteousness at this stage, therefore, is goodness “going it blind,” as the slang phrase is; or, in more orthodox terms, walking by faith, and not by sight.

As long as the child walks in implicit trust in the wisdom and goodness of his parents he cannot go far astray. Ignorant, shortsighted, inexperienced as he is, he nevertheless is guided by a vicarious intelligence, in which the wisdom and experience of the race are reproduced and interpreted for him

in each new crisis by the insight of love. What wonder, then, that the commandment, Honor thy father and thy mother, whether in Hebrew or Chinese legislation, is the great commandment with promise! Not only does the obedient child in particular cases get the consequences which he afterwards comes to see were desirable, but he acquires habits of doing the kind of acts which lead to desirable consequences, and of refraining from the kind of acts which lead to undesirable consequences. These habits are the broad base on which all subsequent character rests, as on a solid rock deeply sunk in the firm soil of the unconscious. As our bodies are first nourished by our mother's milk, our souls are built up first out of the habits of acting which we derive directly from doing what our mothers tell us to do in thousands of specific, concrete cases, and refraining from doing the things their gentle wisdom firmly forbids. The love of mothers is the cord that ties each newborn soul fast to the wisdom and experience of the race. "We are suckled at the breast of the universal ethos," chiefly through the vicarious maternal intelligence. Hence the awful waste, amounting to a crime against both the hard-won ideals and standards of the race and the future character of the child, when indolent, or vain, or ambitious mothers turn over the formative years of their children to ignorant, undeveloped nurses! Though the chances are that the average nurse will

prove quite as wise and good a guide to the young mind as a mother who is capable of turning her child over to the exclusive training of any other guide than herself. The pity is not so much that the ambitious mother relinquishes her highest and holiest function as that there are children born who have mothers capable of doing it. Given such mothers, the nurses are often a great improvement on them.

The derivative, vicarious nature of righteousness at this stage makes clear the need and justification of punishment. The mother sees a great, far-off good, which the child cannot see at all. She commands the child to act in a way to secure this good as a consequence. He disobeys. He loses the consequence which she desires for him. He weakens the indispensable habit of obedience, on which countless other great goods beyond his vision depend. He cannot see vividly either the specific good at which she aims or the general good that flows from the habit of implicit obedience. She then brings within the range of his keen and vivid experience some such minor and transitory evil as a spanking or being sent supperless to bed, and makes him understand that, if he cannot see the good of obedience, he can count with certainty on these evils of disobedience. Punishment, then, is an act of the truest kindness and consideration. It is a help to that instinctive and implicit obedience to

authority, on which the child's greatest good at this stage of his development depends. No child will permanently resent such well-meant punishment. As Mrs. Browning says : —

A mother never is afraid
Of speaking angerly to any child,
Since love, she knows, is justified of love.

The withholding of punishment in such cases is the real cruelty, and the mother who is weak enough to do it is a mawkish sentimentalist, to whom a few passing cries and tears are of more consequence than the future welfare and permanent character of her child. From this point of view, punishment is an act of mercy and kindness, as Plato shows us so clearly in the *Gorgias*. Every mother who believes her child to be ever so little below the angels is bound to substitute the gentler evils of artificial punishment for the greater evils of a life of unpunished naughtiness.

All moral punishment, whether inflicted by parents, schools, colleges, or courts of justice, is of this nature. It helps the offender to see both ends of his deed. When he commits the offense, he sees vividly only one end of it, the temporary advantage to himself as an individual. He does not see with equal vividness the other end, — the injury to the interests of others, and to his own best self as a potential participant in these larger interests. Punishment attempts to bring home to him, if not in

the precise terms of his offense, an eye for an eye, a tooth for a tooth, at least a partial equivalent, in privation of money or liberty or public favor, the other end of his act, which at the time of acting he did not keenly and vividly appreciate. Such strict retribution is the best favor we can confer on an offender, so long as he remains unrepentant. To give him less than this is to cut him off from his only chance to get a right view of his own wrong act. It is the only way to open his eyes to see his act in its totality.

What if a man repents? Shall we still punish him? Not if the repentance is genuine and thoroughgoing. What, then, is true repentance? An evil act, as we have seen, has two ends: one attractive to the individual, for the sake of which he does it; the other injurious to his own better self and to the interests of others. This second end the wrongdoer does not see clearly when he commits the offense. Afterwards he sees it, in its natural consequences,—in the indignation of the offended, in the condemnation of society, in the imminence of punishment. This second part of his act, when it comes home to him, he does not like, but wishes himself well out of it. This, however, is not repentance; and no amount of tears and promises and importunities should ever deceive us into accepting this dislike of unpleasant consequences for a genuine repentance of the wrong act. Every wise parent,

every efficient college officer, every just judge, must harden his heart against all these selfish lamentations, and discount them in advance as a probable part of the culprit's natural programme. Dislike of unpleasant consequences to one's self is not repentance. Repentance must reach back to the original act, and include both the pleasant cause and its unpleasant consequences to others, as well as to one's self, in the unity of one total deed, and then repudiate that deed as a whole. When repentance does that, it does the whole moral work which punishment aims to do. To inflict punishment after such repentance is inexcusable and wanton brutality.

The theory of punishment is clear ; its application is the most difficult of tasks. It is very hard to discriminate in many cases real repentance from dislike of unpleasant personal consequences. Then it is hard to justify severity toward one who is believed to be unrepentant, and absolute forgiveness to one who has shown evidence of true penitence. Whoever has to administer punishment on a large scale, and attempts to be inflexibly retributive to the impenitent and infinitely merciful toward the penitent, must expect to be grossly misunderstood and severely criticised for all he does and all he refrains from doing. If the way of the transgressor is hard, the way of the moral punisher is harder. The state practically confesses its inability to dis-

criminate true from false repentance; and lowers its practice from the moral plane of retribution or forgiveness to the merely legal plane of social protection, giving to the executive a power of pardon by which to correct the more glaring mistakes of the courts. In view of the clumsiness of the means at its disposal, the great diversity of moral condition in its citizens, and the impersonality of its relations, probably this protective theory of punishment, which says to the offender, "I punish you, not for stealing sheep, but to prevent other sheep from being stolen," is the best working theory for practical jurisprudence. But it is utterly unmoral. It has no place in the family. Only in extreme cases is it defensible in school and college. In settling personal quarrels it should have small place. Uncompromising retribution to the impenitent, unreserved forgiveness to the penitent, which Christianity sets forth as the attitude of God, is the only right course for men who are called to perform this infinitely difficult task of moral punishment.

IV. THE SYMBOLICAL VALIDITY OF MORAL LAWS

The success of the ethical life depends on keeping the consequences of our acts, for ourselves and for others, vividly in the foreground of the mind. Personal authority of parents and rulers, supported by swift, sure penalties for disobedience, is the first

great help to the good life. But we cannot always have parents, tutors, and governors standing over us to tell us what to do and what not to do ; to reward us if we do right and punish us if we do wrong. Still less can we afford to rely on natural penalties alone, as they teach us their lessons in the slow and costly school of experience. The next stage of moral development employs as symbols of the consequences we cannot foresee and appreciate maxims to guide the individual life, and laws to represent the claims of our fellows upon us. These maxims and laws have no intrinsic worth. Their authority is all derived and representative. Yet inasmuch as they represent individual or social consequences, they have all the authority of the consequences themselves. More than that, since consequences are particular and limited, while these maxims and laws are universal, these maxims and laws, derivative and representative symbols though they are, have a sacredness and authority far higher and greater than that of any particular consequences for which in a given case they happen to stand.

These maxims and laws are like the items on a merchant's ledger ; or, better still, like the currency which represents the countless varieties of commodities and services we buy and sell. The items on the ledger, the bills in the pocketbook, have no intrinsic value. Yet it were far better for a merchant to be careless about his cotton cloth or

molasses or any particular commodity in which he deals, than to be careless about his accounts, which represent commodities of all kinds; better for any one of us to forget where we laid our coat or our shoes or umbrella, than to leave lying around loose the dollar bills which are symbols of the value of these and a thousand other articles we possess. Precisely so, the authority and dignity of moral maxims and laws are in no way impaired by frankly acknowledging their intrinsic worthlessness. To violate one of these maxims, to break one of these laws, is as foolish and wicked as it would be to set fire to a merchant's ledger, or to tear up one's dollar bills. These maxims and laws are our moral currency, coined by the experience of the race, and stamped with universal approval. Their authority rests on the consequences which they represent; and their validity, as representative of those consequences, is attested by the experience of the race in innumerable cases. A moral law is a prophecy of consequences based on the widest possible induction. Hence the man who seeks a satisfactory future for himself, and for those his act affects, in other words the moral man, must obey these maxims and laws in all ordinary cases without stopping to verify the consequences they represent, any more than an ordinary citizen investigates the solvency of the government every time he receives its legal tender notes.

This illustration at the same time reveals the almost universal validity of moral laws, and yet leaves the necessary room for rare and imperative exceptions. A man may find it wise to burn dollar bills. If he is in camp, and likely to perish with cold, and no other kindling is available, he will kindle his fire with dollar bills. He will be very reluctant to do it, however. He will realize that he is kindling a very costly fire. He will consent to do it only as a last resort, and when the fire is worth more to him, not merely than the intrinsic, but than the symbolic value of the bills. Now there may be rare cases when a moral law must be broken on the same principle that a man kindles a fire with dollar bills. The cases will be about as rare when it will be right to steal or lie as it is rare to find circumstances when it is wise to build a fire with dollar bills. They come perhaps once or twice in a lifetime to one or two in every thousand men. The breaking of a moral law always involves evil consequences, far outweighing any particular good that can ordinarily be gained thereby, through weakening confidence and respect for the validity and authority of the law itself. Yet there are exceptional, abnormal conditions of war, or sickness, or insanity, or moral perversity, where the defense of precious interests against pathological and perverse conditions may warrant the breaking of a moral law, on the same principle that impending freezing

would warrant the lighting of a thousand-dollar fire.

One hesitates to give examples of circumstances which justify the breaking of a moral law, for fear of giving to exceptions a portion of the emphasis which belongs exclusively to the rule, and falling into the moral abyss of a Jesuitical casuistry. Yet it is an invariable rule of teaching never to give an abstract principle without its accompanying concrete case. Hence, if cases must be given, the lie to divert the murderer from his victim, the horse seized to carry the wounded man to the surgeon, the lie that withholds the story of a repented wrong from the scandalmonger who would wreck the happiness of a home by peddling it abroad, are instances of the extreme urgency that might warrant the building of a thousand-dollar bonfire which takes place whenever we break a moral law. The law against adultery, on the other hand, admits no conceivable exception; for no good could possibly be gained thereby that would be commensurate with the undermining of the foundations of the home.

Moral laws are the coined treasures of the moral experience of the race, stamped with social approval. As such they are binding on each individual, as the only terms on which he can be admitted to a free exchange of the moral goods of the society of which he is a member. No man can command the respect of himself or of society who permits

himself to fall below the level of these rigid requirements.

The mere keeping of the law, however, does not make one a moral man. It may insure a certain mediocrity of conduct which passes for respectability. But one is not morally free, he does not get the characteristic dignity and joy of the moral life, until he is lifted clear above a slavish conformity to law into hearty appreciation of the meaning of the law and enthusiastic devotion to the great end at which all laws aim. A juiceless, soulless, loveless Pharisaism is the best morality mere law can give. To protest against the slavery and insincerity of such a scheme was no small part of the negative side of the mission of Jesus and Paul.

Yet the freedom which Jesus brings, the freedom which all true ethical systems insist on as the very breath of the moral life, is not freedom from but freedom in the requirements of the law. It is not freedom to break the law, except in those very rare instances cited above, where the very principle on which the law is founded demands the breaking of the letter of the law in the interest of its own spiritual fulfillment. It is doubtless true that no man keeps any law aright who would not dare to break it. I lack the true respect for life which is at the heart of the law against murder if I would not kill a murderer to prevent him from taking the life of an innocent victim. I do not really love the

right relation between persons which is the heart of truth if I would not dare to deceive a scandal-monger, intent on sowing seeds of bitterness and hate. I do not love that welfare of mankind which is the significance and justification of property if I would be afraid to drive off a horse which did not belong to me to take the wounded man to the surgeon in time to save unnecessary amputation or needless death. I do not believe in that union of happy hearts which is the soul of marriage if I would not, like Caponsacchi, risk hopeless misunderstanding, and shock convention, in order to let the light of love shine on a nature from which it had been monstrously, cruelly, wantonly withheld.

There is nothing antinomian in this freedom in the law. He who will attempt the rôle of Caponsacchi must, like him, have a purity of heart as high above the literal requirements of external law as are the frosty stars of heaven above the murky mists of earth. He who drives off the horse to the surgeon honestly must be one who would sooner cut off his right hand than touch his neighbor's spear of grass for any lesser cause. He who will tell the truthful lie to the scandalmonger must be one who would go to the stake before he would give the word or even the look of falsehood to any right-minded man who had a right to know the truth for which he asks. He who will slay a murderer guiltlessly must be one who would rather, like Socrates,

die a thousand deaths than betray the slightest claim his fellows have upon him. No man may break the least of the moral commandments unless the spirit that is expressed within the commandment itself bids him break it. And such a breaking is the highest fulfillment.

This theoretical explanation of moral laws, with its justification of exceptions in extreme cases, is absolutely essential to a rational system of ethics. Yet it must not blind us to the practically supreme and absolute authority of these laws in ordinary conduct. These moral laws are, as Professor Dewey happily terms them, tools of analysis. They break up a complex situation into its essential parts, and tell us to what class of acts the proposed act belongs, and whether that class of acts is one which we ought to do or not.

The practical man in a case of moral conduct asks what class an act belongs to; and then, having classified it, follows implicitly the dictates of the moral law on that class of cases. Gambling, stealing, drunkenness, slandering, loafing he will recognize at a glance as things to be refrained from, in obedience to the laws that condemn them. He will not stop to inquire into the grounds of such condemnation in each special case. To know the ground of the law, however, helps us to classify doubtful cases, — as, for instance, whether buying stocks on margins is gambling; whether the spoils

system in politics is stealing; whether moderate drinking is incipient drunkenness; whether good-natured gossip about our neighbor's failings is slander; whether a three months' vacation is loafing, and the like. Once properly classified, however, the man who is wise will turn over his ordinary conduct on these points to the automatic working of habit. Habit is the great time-saving device of our moral as well as our mental and physical life. To translate the moral laws which the race has worked out for us into unconscious habits of action is the crowning step in the conquest of character. These laws are our great moral safeguards. They come to us long before we are able to form any theory of their origin or authority, and abide with us long after our speculations are forgotten. If ethical theory is compelled to question their meaning and challenge their authority, it does so in the interest of a deeper morality, which appeals from the letter of the law to the spirit of life of which all laws are the symbolic expression.

V

The Continuity and Contrast of College and the World

He that is not against you is for you. — Luke ix. 50.

He that is not with me is against me. — Luke xi. 23.

THE contrast between college life and life in the outside world is happily indicated in these contrasted texts. In college the lenient law, He that is not against you is for you; in the world outside the severe standard, He that is not with me is against me, prevails. A moment's reflection on the different conditions in college and in the outside world will make plain the reason for the different laws.

College life is artificially simple. With the single exception of club life, it is the narrowest life a man can live. The great realities that condition life in the outside world — the care of the aged, the rearing of the young, the struggle for daily bread, the strain of business, the stress of politics, the weight of professional and administrative responsibility — are either entirely absent or present only in artificial miniature. Welcome checks for the wealthy, generous scholarships for those whose fortune is chiefly their own talent and industry, eliminate the fierce

struggle for existence from this charmed circle of undergraduate life. The absence of the fair sex removes at least to a distance the chief source of emotional interest in real life. Where men touch each other only at a few points, such as social intercourse, class, college, and society politics, college publications, and athletics, the man who can't pass muster on these easy terms must be a hopeless case. With health, wealth, youth, leisure, choice companionship, regular and inspiring but not too difficult tasks, and the enthusiasm of great contests, all provided and thrown into his lap, a man may indeed be dull, selfish, censorious, conceited, cowardly, contemptible. But if he is, sharp eyes are swift to detect and punish him. He is speedily dubbed a "dope" or a "stiff" or a "tripe" or a "snob" or a "berry," or some other of the grotesque, slangy terms, more forcible than elegant, by which college students brand the fellows who are sleepy and tactless, irritable and complaining, self-centred and treacherous. Thus the man who is cheap, the man who "swipes," the man who is swelled-headed, and the man who is sandless either gets these obnoxious qualities taken out of him in the earlier part of his college course, or else is distinctly marked off as a man who is against you. Under this summary treatment, almost every student sooner or later comes to terms; and by the time Junior year is reached, pretty nearly every member of the class has been brought into

line as at least not against you in these cheap forms of self-conceit and self-assertion, of courting favor or dodging difficulty. When Class Day comes, therefore, it finds a group of men who have been trained by each other to be wide-awake and tactful, genial and courteous, kindly in comments on one another, generous in small things as well as in great, and cheerful when things don't quite suit them : men who will give each other their best, and take from their fellows nothing they have not fairly earned ; men who can lose all thought of themselves in devotion to common ends, and who will put forth the last ounce of energy in them before they will be beaten in the game they set out to play, or give up the work they " go in for," or go back on the friends whom they love. Having learned not to be for themselves, and against you, they are rightly regarded as for you, and counted as friends and good fellows for all the rest of your lives.

Henceforth you take your places in the great world of men and women, scholars and toilers, business and politics. The principles which prevail there are precisely the same as those which you have discovered and enforced on each other here. But there is this great difference. Here it is easy to be a good fellow ; there it is much harder. Here you live so close to each other that bad traits are quickly detected and punished ; there they can be concealed for a time, and the penalty may be long delayed.

Here the social forces are all tending to make you a good fellow ; there the dominant forces are working the other way. To be a good fellow in college, as we have seen, means that you shall give your best to your fellows, and take nothing from them you do not fairly earn ; that you shall be brotherly and self-sacrificing. To do these same four things, not in the artificial and sheltered environment of a college, toward a little group of congenial and cultivated men, but in the wider relations of domestic, economic, professional, and political life, toward men and women, high and low, rich and poor, learned and ignorant ; toward all persons in all the broad relations of life to give your best, and take nothing you do not fairly earn, to be brotherly and to be self-sacrificing, — that is what it means in real life to be good fellows, gentlemen, Christians. Let us consider these traits one by one.

First: Give your best. When a young man graduates he is bound to take one of two courses. Either he will look for a place ready-made to fit him, or else he will set out to fit himself for a place. The economic difference between a cheap man and a man who gives his best first comes out there. Edmond Demolins, a French writer on "Anglo-Saxon Superiority: To What it is Due," points out that Anglo-Saxon superiority is due to the fact that the young Anglo-Saxon at once sets out to make a career for himself by his own initiative, originality,

and independence ; while the young Frenchman expects his father to provide him with a government office, a wife, and a dowry. " Ask a hundred young Frenchmen just out of school," he says, " to what careers they are inclined ; three quarters of them will answer you that they are candidates for government offices." This dependence on " ready-made situations, in which advancement is the reward of patience rather than of constant effort," with its attendant negation of initiative, passive obedience, uniformity of opinions and ideas, and absence of individuality, he declares to be the open secret of French inferiority. To cast about to find a soft berth, a good salary, which can be secured by influence and held by inertia, is to start out in life a cheap man. The true Anglo-Saxon is he who looks for a chance somewhere to begin at the bottom, master some single department of this great industrial order, and show to the world that he can do that thing better than any other available man ; not to get onto the pay-roll of some big corporation, or fill a government post which a hundred other men could fill just as well, but to prepare himself to do something so well that the corporation or the government will find his services essential to their highest efficiency. That is the first mark of a high-priced man in the actual life of the world. In private business not to be a parasite, but a sound and healthy member of the working whole ; in political

action to support the government, not simply to be supported by it, is what it means to fulfill in the great outside world the first qualification of a gentleman and a Christian, which you have learned to recognize here in your small student world.

Second: Take nothing you do not pay for, and pay the full price. I will not detain you to speak of literal running in debt, nor of passes, or rebates, or discounts, or favors gained through family influence or professional status or political pull. The honest man will have none of them. I speak of more vital matters. One half of the great world you now enter are women, and they are the better half by far, as all who have known a mother attest. The very best thing in the world is a good woman's love. You can pay for it with nothing less precious than the entire respect and reverence of your own heart. [To receive a woman's love, or even the physical symbol of it, and offer in payment merely transient and unmeant endearment, or, worse still, to offer money, is the meanest form of getting something for less than its price to which a man can descend.] I might point out that it is undermining the most sacred social institution which generations have toiled to evolve; I might say that it is poisoning life at its source; I might introduce the loathsome details and the cruelty to innocent wives and children which the physician so well understands. Here to-day I put it on the plain ground you all

appreciate and approve, — on the ground of simple honesty and common honor, which scorns to get anything under false pretences, and least of all will take from a woman her most precious jewel and not pay its full price.

Third: Be brotherly. You remember how disagreeable it was to have young fellows coming here with their heads full of their own family or wealth or school achievements or personal importance, and how essential it was to give them to understand that the university was of quite as much consequence as they thought themselves to be. When you go out into the world, don't make the same mistake that these swelled-headed fellows made when they came here. Not one man in a thousand in this work-a-day world has had the advantages you have had. But that is no reason why you should hold yourself aloof from these hard-working, plain-living brothers of yours. You eat the bread the farmer, the ranchman, the butcher, the grocer, prepare for you. You live in houses the forester, the stone-cutter, the carpenter, the mason, the painter, the upholsterer furnish for you. You wear the clothing which the shepherd, the plantation hand, the mill-operative, the shopkeeper, the seamstress, the tailor provide for you. You sit by the fire the miner, the locomotive engineer, the brakeman, the sailor, the teamster has built in your grate. Have you yet done anything for them

that is worth as much as these things they are daily doing for you? If not, then look up to them with heartfelt gratitude and admiration, as the soldier says to the water-carrier in Kipling's line, —

You're a better man than I am, Gunga Din.

When you get your work well in hand, then, indeed, you may look on these toiling millions as your brothers, provided you go about your work as cheerfully and steadily and faithfully and efficiently as they on the whole do theirs. But never, never shall you look on them with indifference or condescension. If ever you are able to do your work exceptionally well, if ever it is given you to occupy positions of great influence, then if you are true men, with the true instinct of human brotherhood, the chief satisfaction you will find in it all will be the thought that the efficiency of the corporation you control, or the soundness of the professional counsel you give, or the beneficence of the public policy you carry out, or the justice of the views you disseminate, may help to make the laborer's work more steady and his wages more fair, his street more healthful and his home more happy, his government more pure and his lot in life more worthy of man. You may or may not enter into distinctively settlement and philanthropic work. Valuable as these things are, they can do little more than alleviate symptoms. Even that every

man ought to engage in who can. The solution, however, of our great social problem must come through just such well-trained, energetic, ambitious fellows as you, who get professional skill, corporate wealth, political power in their hands, and then use it, not, like the first souls Dante discovered in hell, "for themselves," but to give every worker his chance of steady employment and his fair share of the worth of his work, and to make possible for the working man and working woman a domestic, social, intellectual, moral, and spiritual life that is really worth living. The man who goes into life with such a sense of brotherhood and an earnest desire to add his little mite to the common stock of human welfare will not be much troubled with the sense of his own self-importance.

Fourth: Be self-sacrificing. Hegel tells us in one of his profoundest passages that in the eye of fate *all* action is guilt, for it is necessarily one-sided, — for the sake of one set of interests it sacrifices another set of interests equally vital. You must sacrifice; you must suffer. The great claims we have been considering and the clamor of our petty appetites and passing passions never coincide, but are in perpetual warfare. You may side with the petty private good, which circumstances and companions are never wanting to reinforce; but in order to do that you sacrifice the large social claims, the wide area of human good. In doing so

you array these larger powers against you. They visit you with disease, degradation, disgrace, disaster, death. The best part of you suffers; the suffering is imposed upon you by alien and hostile forces. You live the life of an outlaw, and you die the death of a slave.

Or you may serve the larger good, and live in loyalty to the claims of human brotherhood and the social law of God. Then it will be the lower and the lesser side of you on which the suffering falls, and even that will be freely chosen and cheerfully endured for the sake of the larger good. To suffer in this way is to be free and strong and brave. In the language of the Second Epistle of Peter, it is to suffer, not as an evil-doer, but as a Christian.

Start where you will in the moral world, if you follow principles to their conclusions they always lead you up to Christ. He touched life so deeply, so broadly, and so truly that all brave, generous living is summed up in him. Starting with the code you have here worked out for yourselves, translating it into positive terms, and enlarging it to the dimensions of the world you are about to enter, your code becomes simply a fresh interpretation of the meaning of the Christian life. All that we have been saying has its counterpart in that great life of his. He gave his best; and how good and beneficent it was! A few years of kindly ministry to human needs as he found them, in the street and

in the home, on the highway and in the temple! A few discourses to unappreciative crowds gathered on the hillside or by the lake-shore, with patient interpretation to a little group of learners, only slightly less dull and slow than the masses whence they came! Yet what countless homes have been made happier, what a mighty mass of misery has been lifted, what priceless blessings have been conferred by institutions his spirit has informed, what splendid nobility of character has been inspired in millions of his followers, through love to him who in this brief, simple life in an obscure Roman province gave to the world his best! To be for him in this twentieth century means that in all the complexity of business, political, and social life, whether it is asked or declined, whether it is appreciated or criticised, whether it is admired or condemned, you give to the world your best.

He took nothing he did not pay for. To minister rather than to be ministered unto was his aim. He had not where to lay his head. The world was his debtor. The extreme simplicity of life which he found incidental to the life of a teacher in an ancient oriental community is by no means enjoined upon you. Large work in these days generally requires considerable of what Aristotle called "furniture of fortune." The banker, the railroad president, the corporation counsel, the mayor cannot do their best work on the terms on which the

foxes and the birds of the air do theirs. But the principle of Jesus, the principle that no poor man shall work the harder, no woman shall be sadder, no good institution shall be weaker, and no bad custom more prevalent, for aught that we have done or left undone; that principle holds for us as firmly as it did when Jesus first proclaimed and practiced it. So to live is to be for Christ. To take from man or woman, private corporation or government office, anything for which you do not give a full equivalent, is to be against Christ to-day.

He said and did nothing of himself, nor for his own glory. He simply said and did what the situation called for, and tact, sympathy, friendliness, and brotherhood suggested. The only greatness he encouraged in his followers was the greatness of service. To be for Christ is to have the sense that the lowliest who are affected one way or the other by your action are, unconsciously and indirectly and incidentally for the most part, but yet genuinely and substantially, made a little richer, wiser, healthier, happier, by what you are doing.

He suffered. If you put aside the veils of interpretation theologians have drawn over that simple fact, his suffering speaks for itself. He had the choice that comes to all. On the one side he saw personal popularity within the narrow circle of his few chosen friends and admirers, yet with it the certainty that his name and his work would die

with him, — leaving the national sins unrebuked, the national religion unreformed, the world's sinfulness unexposed, the true life of man and the great love of God unrevealed. On the other side he saw his work put on a world-wide basis, his message and spirit bequeathed to mankind for all time ; but for himself, the envy of pontifical cliques and the hatred of political rings ; the scourge, the thorn-crown, and the cross. The latter he cheerfully chose.

To be for him in our day is to be for the costly right against the profitable wrong ; for unpopular truth against unanimous error ; for patient, plodding details of duty, against specious and tawdry abstractions ; for the exposed frontier of progress, against stagnation intrenched in tradition.

The college, like the Christian home, is so organized that mere non-resistance, mere acceptance of the influences that surround you, tends to make one a gentleman and a Christian. Even if a man inclines to drop below the standard which the college community sets up, keen eyes are on him, and kindly criticism promptly calls attention to his defects. He that is not against you is for you.

In the world the other law prevails. The tendencies are strong against the higher life. There non-resistance is destruction. For in the complexity of social life the average man does not see the bearing of these baser traits as you see them among

yourselves here. A man can palm off poor work, and get something for nothing ; he can put on airs in public and be a coward at heart, and deceive the world for a time. In offices and stores, in railway trains and hotel corridors, in factories and mines, in court-rooms and lobbies, the pressure of the environment is not up, but down ; not toward the just, generous, brave, brotherly life, but toward selfish indulgence and gain at no matter what cost of cruel injustice to the people who afford you amusement or out of whom your money is made.

The Christ of the twentieth century is not exactly the same as the sectarian Christ of the nineteenth, or the dogmatic Christ of the sixteenth, or the official Christ of the thirteenth, or the metaphysical Christ of the fourth, or even the Christ after the flesh, which Paul had already outgrown in the first century. The Christ of the twentieth century is preëminently the social Christ, and is greater than all that has gone before. He is the Christ who will give of his best to the world, and take no more than he gives ; the Christ who calls the poorest his brother, and will endure all things for his sake.

There is not a man among you who wishes to be against such a glorious Christ as that : who would get his living or any part of it out of the world without giving at least as good as he gets, who would make the lot of the world's toilers the harder

by shifting his own load onto them. Yet that is precisely what you will find yourselves doing, unless you are positively and earnestly for Christ. The only way to escape it is to give yourselves to him in entire consecration as you now go out into life; and then as opportunity offers, whether in Catholic cathedral or Methodist chapel, whether in the crowded streets of noisy cities or alone upon the prairie under the silent stars, to renew day by day your devotion to him, and the just, generous, brotherly, brave social service for which the Christ of the twentieth century stands.

VI

The More Excellent Way

Covet earnestly the best gifts: and yet show I unto you a more excellent way. — 1 Cor. xii. 31.

MY theme is not the familiar and fundamental distinction between good and evil. Taking that for granted, my text proceeds to subdivide the good into degrees ; contrasting the good and the more excellent.

I might set forth the difference between the two ways by abstract definition, and say that one is subjective, the other objective ; one introspective, the other self-forgetful ; one abnormal and artificial, the other healthy and natural ; one cold and calculating, the other hearty and generous. I might picture the self-conscious struggle for personal excellence, with its morbid conscientiousness, its perpetual alternation of hope and despair, its frequent self-examinations, its rigorous, self-imposed exactions, its close and stifling atmosphere of self-centred solicitude ; and over against all that portray the cheerful confidence, the exulting eagerness, the glorious liberty to be found in that more excellent way which leads along the sunlit heights of arduous endeavor for the love of God and for the help of man.

Verbal definition and description, however, give us at best only faint images, while what we want is, if possible, to grasp the idea itself. Now an idea, if true and real, always has more than one embodiment, and crops out in many spheres. Universality of application is the test of the truth of an idea. Let us then try first to discover our idea in the more familiar spheres of every-day affairs. If we can find it in the gymnasium and study, we shall be all the better able to apprehend it when we come back to the chapel.

There are two ways of physical development: one good, the other more excellent. One way says, Covet earnestly the best physical gifts. Aim directly at the cultivation of health, strength, and symmetry. Follow out minutely the directions laid down in the Handbook of Developing Exercises. Keep the eye constantly upon the lines of the Anthropometric Chart. Test your development by frequent examinations and measurements.

This method is good. It is infinitely better than no method. For students, for men and women whose occupations confine them within doors the greater part of the day, this is the best method available. For you, as you are situated here, it is the essential and indispensable condition of maintaining health and increasing strength.

Yet for those who can avail themselves of it there is a more excellent way. Forgetting all

about muscles and their measurements, the Handbook and its directions, the gymnasium and its apparatus, the man who follows the more excellent way will live an outdoor life. He will hunt and fish, fell trees and make hay, build fences and lay stone walls, plough and sow and reap and thresh. The woman who follows the better way will walk, skate, row, ride horseback, climb mountains, bathe in the surf, do housework, have a garden of her own, and take care of plants and animals.

The first method gives muscle; the second gives muscle and nerve both. One gives strength; the other gives vigor, vitality, and endurance. One produces for the time a great many points of special excellence; the other builds up and holds in reserve a store of energy lasting for years, and convertible into any form which the occasion may require.

Thus the objective method, which loses thought of self-development in the pursuit of definite external ends, not only accomplishes its immediate aims, but at the same time gives a physical development compared with which the development of the mere pupil of gymnastics is in every essential respect inferior.

There are two ways in the intellectual life, — one good as far as it goes, the other more excellent. The first way is the way of intellectual ambition. It says, "Covet earnestly the best intellectual

gifts." It seeks culture for the sake of having it, and strives for intellectual accomplishments for the pride it has in their possession. It studies for rank, and is covetous of academic degrees and honors.

Now, this is not altogether bad. As compared with idleness and indifference, it marks a great advance. At certain stages in student life this intellectual ambition ought to be stimulated and encouraged.

Yet, sooner or later, every student who is to become a scholar must enter upon a more excellent way, as far above mere intellectual ambition as that is above indolence and mental sloth. In the course of your studies has there ever appeared to you a vision of one or another of the sisterhood of sciences — Philology, Mathematics, History, Chemistry, or Literature — claiming you as her servant by the divine right of the affinity of her truths for your mind? And, in response, has there stirred within you a burning desire to have the vision become to you an abiding presence, a perpetual inspiration? Have you felt eager and glad to devote your life to making the vision of that truth first of all distinct and clear to your own eyes, and then to become the interpreter of its majesty and beauty to the world? And have you so surrendered yourself to this high and holy service of the truth that all concern as to what of

honor or neglect, fame or obscurity, wealth or poverty, may come to you in consequence of your scholarly pursuits, is lost in the fullness of joy which the nearer and clearer communion with your science gives from day to day?

If you have thus seen and felt truth's compelling charm, and if you have found out the delight of studying for truth's sake, then you know that he that is least in the kingdom of such genuine scholarship is greater than the greatest of those who strive to climb to distinction on the ladder of intellectual ambition.

If you have seen no such vision and responded to no such call, then indeed you may be useful and honorable in other spheres and relationships of life; you may do good service in the lower grades of teaching; you may know many things and win much fame for your cleverness; but the highest spheres of intellectual life, with their "calm pleasures and majestic pains," must remain for you forever closed.

It makes all the difference in the world — intellectually it is a question of health and life or disease and death — whether you find this better way or not. The student who is animated by mere ambition does not hold out long after leaving college. The actual world has no ranking system, no scheme of so much honor for so much toil, no food prepared at stated intervals for intellectual vanity to

feed upon. Truth herself, however, to her true followers then becomes most sweet and sustaining when artificial stimulus is withdrawn.

Hence the one way renders the student proud, haughty, and exacting. The other way keeps the student meek, modest, and gentle. The follower of the one grows sour and bitter as the dragging years bring less and less of recognition. The disciple of the other grows sweet and cheerful as the busy, eager days bring fresh food for thought and inquiry.

The one is boastful of what he has done and can do, but in time of real trial he is found wanting. The other is unconscious and distrustful of his powers; but put him face to face with concrete difficulty and duty, and he is equal to the task.

If now we have formed an idea of the distinction between the good and the more excellent way in physical and intellectual pursuits, we are prepared to appreciate the difference between the two ways of spiritual life.

One method says: Covet earnestly the best spiritual gifts. Be anxious about your individual soul's salvation. Make sure of an abundant entrance into heaven. Cultivate assiduously the Christian graces. Examine yourself frequently to see whether you are making satisfactory progress.

According to this method the fundamental question is, "What shall I do to be saved?" The start-

ing-point is the man himself; and God is thought of primarily as the instrumentality by which this salvation is to be wrought out. To be sure, this method includes the thought and the desire that other individuals must be saved according to the same plan. Herein lies its missionary motive. And a powerful motive it has been, and noble is the work it has accomplished.

Indeed, it is to the strong infusion of this way of thinking, permeating the religious life of New England for a quarter of a millennium as the salt permeates the waters of the sea, that we owe what is grandest and noblest in our life at home, and what is most potent and beneficent in the influence of New England over other sections of our own country and on foreign missionary ground. A full and generous recognition of the goodness of this way, however, ought not to prevent us from seeing and pursuing a way more excellent, if such there be.

What, then, is this more excellent way? It is the devotion of heart and life to God's loving will, revealed in Christ, whose object is the well-being of mankind.

Wherein does this differ from the previous way? Its starting-point is God and his eternal love, not man and his lost condition. Its characteristic question is not that of the terrified Philippian jailer, who, in his confusion and despair, and on the point

of suicide, cried out, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" That was the question of a man of whom we know nothing more than that he and his household were baptized and made happy.

That is good; but the question characteristic of the more excellent way is the question of the Apostle himself, who, when the vision of the Christ came to him, exclaimed, "Who art thou, Lord?" This is the question of the man whose conversion carried with it the conversion of the Western world.

Not anxious solicitude to make the best possible provision for self here and hereafter, but eager earnestness to know God and to serve him now and evermore, — this is the starting-point in the more excellent way. Not the salvation of self, not the cultivation of private graces and personal gifts, but the knowledge of God and the service of our fellow-men, God's children, is its end and aim. Not our own blessedness as a consequence of God's special favor to us as individuals, but the greatness of God's love and the joy we may have in sharing with God this universal love of his to all his children, — this is the motive and inspiration of this better sort of religious life.

The better way is consistent with the possession of the highest gifts. Indeed, it calls for them, it uses them, it makes the most of them. But it seeks them not for their own sake, not for the sake of the satisfaction the individual takes in having them,

not for the promise they give of future happiness, but for the worth they have as instruments for expressing and realizing the glorious love of God toward all his children. Yet while this more excellent way makes the best and highest use of all religious gifts, it is still something more and higher than any or all these gifts. One may have all faith and all orthodoxy ; one may be active in prayer-meeting and Sabbath-school ; one may engage in charitable and missionary work ; one may be first in all these things, and at the same time be last in the identification of heart and life with God's loving will toward all his children, which is the essence of the better way.

Wherever, underneath our church attendance, our Bible reading, our prayers, our contributions, there lurks a secret sense that in some way or other these are things which we must do, conditions we must fulfill, if we are to be saved, there the characteristic excellence of the purest, noblest Christianity is marred, defaced, and obscured by slavish bondage, by hard legalism, by ignoble fear. Wherever duty is done, as in the case of Aurora Leigh's dutiful aunt,

As if fearful that God's saints
Would look down suddenly and say, " Herein
You missed a point, I think,"

the Christ-likeness of such Christianity is altogether wanting. The more excellent way rises above and

beyond these "miserable aims that end in self." Just as the opportunity to do a daring deed calls out the strong man's strength, with no conscious deliberation whether he wants exercise or not ; just as the inherent charm of truth draws to itself the scholar's mind by a force of such resistless majesty and might that all the proffered supports of personal advantage and ambition are brushed contemptuously aside as hindrances rather than helps, — so to the soul destined to enter the more excellent way of the religious life there comes a sense of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.

Those grand old words, "calling and election," have a meaning, — lost and obscured and much misunderstood indeed, but well worth our effort to find out again. God's call may come in many ways. The reading of the Gospel story, to such as, amid the jargon of interpretation that clouds it in our day, can read it in its simplicity and purity, — the simple reading of that story is enough to call a chosen soul to God. This Son of Man, going about among his fellow-men to do them good, healing the sick and warning the wayward, robbing death of its terrors and giving to the wedding feast a preternatural joy, doing the grandest work of revolutionizing the spiritual life of a nation and of the world with childlike modesty and meekness and performing the meanest services in the royal majesty of love, always on terms of friendly human

helpfulness with those whose character and lives most needed it, and pouring scorn and contempt on the pretentious affectations of religion, making his life a constant ministry, his death a crowning sacrifice for the redemption of the race, — has the reading of that sublime story ever made you feel that there is portrayed a life so noble, an aim so high, a spirit so holy, a work so grand and glorious, that apart from it you can conceive no life, no aim, no work worthy of being cherished? If the story of our Lord's life and death has this supreme attraction for you, this is God's call to you.

The occasion of God's call may be the instituted worship of the church, the words of a preacher, the example of devout father or mother, friend or neighbor, the silent meditation of the soul in seeming solitude. In some way or other, there comes to every soul destined to walk in the more excellent way a conception of the nobility, the glory, the supreme worthiness, the absolute divineness of that ministry to the highest well-being of man which Jesus perfectly embodied and in which pure Christianity consists. This conception of the supreme worthiness and attractiveness of the Christian ideal, which comes in some form or other to each of God's chosen ones, — this is the call of God.

The sense that this life of loving coöperation with God and Christ in serving your fellow-men, God's children, is the true life, the real life, the only

life in which you can find freedom and joy, the scope for action and the secret of repose, — this conviction wrought within you is the evidence that you are one of God's chosen ones. And to rise and obey that call, actually to repent of and renounce all lower and less noble aims and purposes, and to devote heart and life to the doing of that loving will of God, in Christ-like service of your fellows, — this is the way to “make your calling and election sure.”

This disposition to put God first rather than second, this tendency to find in God's eternal love in Jesus Christ the all-sufficient motive to Christian conduct and character, in private and in public, in the individual and in the church, at home and abroad, — this is the theological foundation on which the more excellent way of religious thought and life must rest.

Our fathers brought with them to this country the phrases of this profounder creed. How came it about, then, that we have so far drifted away from it? The trouble was that the children gradually forgot the simple and obvious meaning of these terms. God's call came to mean something mysterious, something exclusive, something to be waited for. Election came to be viewed as an arbitrary transaction performed ages ago somewhere in the skies.

Such nonsense as that, shrewd Yankee common

sense rightly rejected. And so we came to have here in New England a theology which starts with the powers of the human will, and appeals to human self-interest, instead of the theology which starts with the eternal, redeeming love of God revealed in Christ, and appeals to the all-powerful attractiveness which this Divine Ideal has for as many as are able to appreciate and receive him.

To recover the plain meaning of these deep truths, and to restore the eternal love of God in Jesus Christ to its rightful place as the supreme and sufficient motive to Christian life and work, is the theological problem of our day ; the indispensable prerequisite to any considerable and permanent advance in the more excellent way of practical religious life.

In conclusion, let us consider two points of superiority which the method of devotion to God's loving will for all his children has over the method of solicitude about the saving of our individual souls. The two chief points of superiority are gentleness and strength.

By gentleness we mean that quality which makes easy adjustment with others, which springs from a delicate appreciation of others' feelings, which always takes into account the point of view of others, and so renders the individual's conduct not the arbitrary self-assertion of his own separate will, but the resultant of all the wills that are rightfully

concerned in his conduct and are affected by it. Hence gentleness toward others is kind, long-suffering, not easily provoked; because the interests of others, their points of view, their trials, their temptations, are ever present to its thought. Toward itself, gentleness is not puffed up, does not behave itself unseemly, vaunteth not itself; simply because it has something better to do than always to be thinking about itself.

The whole secret of gentleness, you see, lies in this: that its thought is not concentrated upon itself, but is bestowed freely on others. Hence the coveting of the best gifts and solicitude about the present state and future prospects of our individual souls beget a habit and temper of mind which is the direct opposite of the habit and temper on which gentleness depends. A certain hardness, harshness, severity, and readiness in condemning others; a corresponding pride, self-sufficiency, insistence on one's own forms of worship, modes of statement, and hopes of heaven as better than everybody's else, is the logical outcome of this exaggeration of the subjective side of the religious life.

On the other hand, that method which apprehends the love of God in Christ for all mankind, and eagerly devotes itself to coöperation with that loving will because it feels and knows that this is the highest, noblest, truest way of life, — this

method falls in with that very manner of thinking on which, as we have seen, gentleness depends. If we can learn to think of the people whom we meet in some measure as the loving Father thinks of them, pitying their infirmities and failings, ready to pardon their sins at the first dawn of penitence, entering with sympathetic appreciation into their joys and sorrows, their hopes and fears, and seeking for them in everything their highest good, we should thereby acquire the secret of that gentleness which rejoices with those that do rejoice and weeps with those that weep; which is so glad in others' prosperity that there is no room for envy, and so sorry for others' shortcomings that there is no place left for rejoicing in their iniquity; which is so intent on others' good that there is no time left for a seeking of its own advantage, and no energy left to spend in feeding and fattening its own separate selfhood. To see in every fellow-being a child of the heavenly Father, and to stand ready by every appropriate word and deed to manifest the Father's loving regard for each child of his, irrespective of the wealth or poverty, the high or low degree, the attractiveness or the uncongeniality, the friendliness or enmity in which this child of the Father comes to you, — this is at once the secret of Christian gentleness and the characteristic of the more excellent way of Christian life.

The other point of superiority of the more excel-

lent way is strength ; strength both for endurance and for work.

Now, both methods have strength. Neither is altogether weak. Compared with the mere child of nature, the Stoic, the Abstract Idealist, the Puritan, the man who covets the best gifts, the man who, in one form or another, sets up a standard of what his own individual soul must attain, — that man is a man of mighty strength. And yet there are elements of weakness in this type of character from which the more excellent way makes one free.

What, then, is strength of character? Strength is the ability to make one's outward act the expression and realization of one's inward purpose. Hence a man's strength depends ultimately on the purpose which he cherishes, and is proportioned to the length and breadth and depth of that purpose. The man without a purpose is utterly weak, the sport of circumstances, the football of society. The man of limited purpose is strong within the limits which his purpose embraces. The highest strength, however, goes with a purpose wide and comprehensive enough to embrace the whole of life. Coveting the best gifts, self-perfection, the seeking of salvation, is a comparatively broad purpose. It is much broader and higher than the pursuit of wealth, fame, or knowledge ; and consequently it makes a stronger man than any of these motives.

Yet it has its limitations. Put your Stoic or your salvation-seeker, — for their attitude is essentially the same, except where salvation is thought of as future happiness, in which case the salvation-seeker must rank not with the Stoics, but with the Epicureans, — put this type of character in a place where there is no chance of making converts to his views, compel him to associate with stupid and uninteresting people, subject him to the vexations and irritations of a life of obscure drudgery, expose him to the opposition and enmity of evil men. He will not give up the fight, but he will draw into himself, and limit the contest to the inner citadel of his own mind. Trials he will use as occasions for the development of fortitude and the exercise of faith. Vexations will be accepted as a discipline in patience. Injury and abuse will be welcomed as affording occasion for growth in meekness and resignation. Wrong and evil will afford opportunity for forbearance and forgiveness. And losses and privations will be hailed as helps to self-denial and self-conquest.

That there is a good deal of strength of character involved in taking the world in this way we all admit. And yet it strikes us, after all, as forced, unnatural, and artificial. This sort of talk reminds us always of the boy who whistles when he goes through the cemetery at night to keep his courage up. Strength there is; but it is not sufficient to.

gain a thorough mastery over life, and to maintain an easy and permanent supremacy. It is forever on the rack of exertion, and the exhausting efforts it is compelled to make in order to maintain itself betray the presence of weakness and distrust.

Very different is the strength afforded by the more excellent way. He who can see in every sphere God's loving will, and finds his joy in the doing of that will, never can be placed in circumstances of which he is not the perfect master. Poverty and obscurity, drudgery and toil, no less than wealth, fame, leisure, and publicity, afford abundant opportunity for the doing of the Father's will.

His loving-kindness includes the unthankful and the evil, as well as the grateful and the good; and toward the one class the will of God can be done by us just as effectively, just as thoroughly, just as cheerfully and gladly, as toward the other. People may come to us with enmity and hate, with treachery and malice; but that need not prevent us from finding our peace and joy in doing God's will of love and kindness toward them.

You can never be placed in circumstances so unfavorable, you can never be brought in contact with a person so mean and hateful, that this devotion to the loving will of God as applied to those circumstances and that person will not give you strength to do the right, true, noble, loving act;

and so to overcome evil with good. This better way is not content with grimly holding its own within the contracted citadel of self. It goes out on every occasion to conquer the world by righteousness and love. Its strength is not absorbed in perpetual self-defense. It is ever aggressive, and gives you power to love your enemies, to bless them that curse you, and to pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you. God's loving will for all his children, as it is revealed to us in Christ, taken up as the substance and aim of the individual's personal will, is the secret of this highest strength, the strength that beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things; that never fails of doing righteously, joyfully, lovingly, successfully, whatever it undertakes; that, in conflict with the worst that malice and spite and wrong and hate can do, is able not only to abide invincible, but to come off more than conqueror.

Every great institution has its own type of thought and life. From every meeting-point of human souls radiate far and wide influences benign and helpful in proportion to the excellence of the life which animates the central source.

In its earlier days, our country has been blessed with noble institutions devoted to the education of women. They were on a lower intellectual level than the college; and their religious life moved more largely on what by contrast we are compelled

to call the lower or self-conscious plane. Yet their influence for good, intellectually and spiritually, upon our American life and in missionary work in foreign lands, has been incalculable.

The colleges for women have, for the most part, their career still before them. Intellectually, they mark an immense advance over the academies and seminaries which preceded them. May we not hope and believe that, with the rise and growth of these colleges, there shall be given to our land a type of piety at once higher and healthier, more gentle and more strong? The world looks to you for a religious life which, without morbidness, shall be intense and earnest; without sentimentality, shall be winsome and attractive; without weakness, shall be mild and gentle; and, without bigotry, shall be robust and strong.

You cannot rise to the high level of these demands by the method of self-seeking in religious things. Relying on that method alone, there will be an unhealthiness, an unpracticalness, an unreality and emptiness about your religious life painfully suggestive of the sounding brass and the tinkling cymbal, and mournfully prompting the sad confession, "All this profiteth me nothing, and I myself am nothing."

Seek not, then, merely to save your own souls. Seek first of all to know God in Jesus Christ, and to be known of him. And then strive that in and

through your lives and labors, your words and deeds, your powers and your opportunities, the loving will of God, revealed in Christ, may have expression and fulfillment in the renovating of human lives, the gladdening of human hearts, the bettering of society, and the redemption of the race.

Thus, walking in the more excellent way of self-devotion to the Divine Father's loving will for his human children, you shall have true fellowship with our great Elder Brother, whose person and life and work are the full and perfect incarnation of this better way; and, in losing the life of separate selfhood, you shall find the life of eternal blessedness which is hid with Christ in God.

VII

The Sacrifices of a College Man

And David longed, and said, Oh that one would give me water to drink of the well of Bethlehem, which is by the gate! And the three mighty men brake through the host of the Philistines, and drew water out of the well of Bethlehem, that was by the gate, and took it, and brought it to David: but he would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto the Lord. And he said, Be it far from me, O Lord, that I should do this: shall I drink the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives? therefore he would not drink of it. — 2 Samuel xxiii. 15-17.

AMID the rough realities of Cripple Creek or Klondike one often sees gleams of heroism for the like of which, amid the refined conventionalities of Fifth Avenue or Beacon Street, one would look long in vain. Civilization and culture, indeed, have a heroism of their own; but it is modest and retiring, and it takes a practiced eye to discern the face of it behind the veil. In primitive communities, on the contrary, virtue and vice alike stand out so plain that he who runs may read. This text relates a scene from the lives of the outlawed adherents of an outlaw chief. We must not idealize these men because their deeds have been enshrined in Holy Writ. In fact, the Scripture record, rightly read, permits no pious illusions as to the sort of men who gathered in this camp. Here is the list: Every one that was in distress, and every

one that was in debt, and every one that was discontented, gathered themselves unto David; and he was captain over them: the very classes, you perceive, who flock to the standard of a Catiline or a Coxey. Yet out of the rude camp of these rough men there flashes forth the essential splendor of all chivalry and all nobility. The chief longs for a drink of the water of the well which used to quench his childhood's thirst, but which is now within the lines of the Philistine camp. It is a mere passing whim, a bit of human sentiment. It is a wish, not a will; a yearning, not a command. Yet, to gratify that whimsical wish, that sentimental longing, three mighty men cut their way through the hostile lines, and at the risk of their lives bring back the wished-for water. Then comes David's great response. He will not drink the water, but pours it out unto the Lord. "And he said, Be it far from me, O Lord, that I should do this: shall I drink the blood of the men that went in jeopardy of their lives? therefore he would not drink of it." To give one's life is a noble thing. To recognize the sacredness of the gift, and to receive it worthily, is a higher, rarer form of nobleness. It is by this high standard that I invite you to measure yourselves. The sacredness of the things that are bought with human life, and the way a true man treats them, — that is my theme.

You all admire David for refusing to drink the

life-blood of his friends. You would despise him had he drank it. You all feel sure that you would have done as he did, in the same circumstances. Well, admiration at long range is good. But I must press home the harder question, What are you doing in actual conditions which involve the same essential principle? This simple story from the crude conditions of primitive warfare is to serve as a clue to the intricate labyrinth of modern social life. For these modern social conditions are ever offering to us the life-blood of our fellows; and the souls are rare that have the heroism to put the costly cup away, still rarer the souls who combine with this heroism the wisdom to make of this precious cup an acceptable offering to the Lord. Let us, then, apply this principle to four aspects of our life, — wealth, pleasure, politics, faith.

First, Wealth. Do you realize how much of human life there is stored up in what we eat and wear and spend and use? Food and raiment, fire and light, shelter and rest, are bought for us by the exposure of the lone shepherd on the mountain-side, the weary weaver at her loom, the weather-beaten sailor before the mast, the engineer driving his train against the storm, the miner in the bowels of the earth, the woodsman in the depths of the forest, the fisherman off the foggy banks, the plowman in the monotonous furrow, the cook drudging in the kitchen, the washerwoman bending over the tub,

and the countless host of artisans and teamsters and common laborers who form the broad, firm base on which our civilization rests.

Because of this high human cost of material goods, all waste is wickedness, all ostentation is disgrace, all luxury that is not redeemed by uses to be explained later is criminal. The food or raiment that you waste is simply so much human toil and sacrifice which you by your wastefulness render null and void. The wealth and state you ostentatiously display simply show the world how much of the vitality of other men and women you burn up in order to keep your poor self going. To boast of riches, to take pride in luxury, is as though an engine should boast of the quantity of coal it could consume, regardless of work accomplished; as though a farm should be proud of the fertilizer spread upon it, regardless of the crop raised in return. What is the real nature of the idle rich? Precisely what do they amount to in the world? To eat the bread that other men have toiled to plant and reap and transport and cook and serve; to wear the silk and woolen that other women have spun and woven and cut and sewed; to lie in a couch that other hands have spread, and under a roof that other arms have reared; not that alone — for we all do as much — but to consume these things upon themselves with no sense of gratitude and fellowship toward the toiling men and women

who bring these gifts ; with no strenuous effort to give back to them something as valuable and precious as that which they have given to us ; that is the meanness and selfishness and sin and shame of wealth that is idle and irresponsible. Against riches as such no sane man has a word to say. Against rich men who are idle and irresponsible, against rich women who are ungrateful and unserviceable, the moral insight cries out in righteous indignation, and brands them as parasites, receiving all and giving nothing in return ; in the language of our text, gulping down the life-blood of their fellows, without so much as a " thank you " in return.

That brings us to the old question, Can a rich man enter the kingdom of heaven ? Assuredly, yes. All things are possible with God, and to right-minded men. It is, indeed, harder for a rich man than for a poor man, for obvious reasons. Being a Christian, or entering the kingdom of God, simply means that, instead of setting up yourself and your possessions as ends in themselves, you shall make yourself, and all you have, organic, functional, instrumental, serviceable to the great and glorious purposes of God, for the welfare and blessedness of men. And the more you are and the more you have, the harder it is to bring yourself and your possessions into this organic and functional subordination to the will that makes for human happiness and social virtue. But just because it is so hard,

therefore it is all the more glorious. The rich Christian is God's finest masterpiece in the world to-day.

The man whose office is a pivot around which revolve in integrity and beneficence the wheels of industry and commerce, affording employment and subsistence to thousands of his fellows ; the woman whose home is a centre of generous hospitality, whence ceaseless streams of refinement and charity flow forth to bless the world ; the person whose leisure and culture and wealth and influence are devoted to the direction of forces, the solution of problems, the organization of movements which require large expenditure of time and money — these men and women who are at the same time rich and Christian, these are the salt of our modern society ; by such comes the redemption of the world ; of such, no less than of the Christian poor, is the kingdom of heaven. No honest man grudges these Christian rich their wealth. It matters not whether their income is five hundred or fifty thousand a year. The question is whether the little or the much is made organic to the glory of God and the good of humanity. And the greater the amount of wealth thus organized and utilized, the greater the glory and the larger the good. That is what it means in terms of wealth for the modern man to refuse to drink the precious water from the well of Bethlehem, and to pour it out unto the Lord.

Second, Pleasure. Pleasure is Nature's premium on healthy exercise of function. The more of it the better. There is no asceticism about the Gospel of Jesus Christ, though his followers have often tried to tack it on. We all like pleasure, and are not ashamed to own it. Not suppression but fruition is the ideal of our nature. The modern world agrees with Beecher when he says, "My conception of religion is to let every faculty effulge, touched with celestial fire." The Son of Man came eating and drinking and rejoicing, and shedding joy and gladness wherever he went. And the man who catches his spirit will find his own life more and more full of happiness. And I mean by that real, live, human happiness, not the pale, sickly counterfeit that lights up the countenances of emaciated hermits and psalm-singing pietists. Whatever ministers to the exaltation of body or of mind, whatever stirs the blood and quickens the pulses and thrills the nerves, is so far forth a good to be desired. There is not a bad appetite or passion in our nature, unless perversion makes it so. Our bodies are good; and every physiological function is good, and the pleasure that comes of it a thing to be rejoiced in as the seal of vigor and vitality. Our minds are good; and all the joys of mental exercise are glorious witnesses to the divine image in which we are made. Our hearts' loves are good, and tender ties that bind us together in families and friend-

ships and mutual affections are the best gifts of God to men.

There is, however, one condition of all noble pleasure. You must not buy it with the life-blood of your fellows ; you shall not purchase it at the cost of human degradation. The attempt to regulate pleasure and amusement by rule is mischievous and futile. The attitude of many good people toward cards and billiards, the theatre and the dance, is a concession to the devil of things that are altogether too good for him to monopolize. All these and kindred things are good, provided you do not pay too high a price for them. When billiards or cards are used to undermine the foundations of honest industry in a fellow-man ; when they are used to make one man's gain conditioned on another's loss ; when they divert the wages of the breadwinner from the support of his family to the till of the gambler or the saloon-keeper, then these things, innocent and beneficent in themselves, become heavy with the weight of human misery, black with the odium of human degradation.

The beauty of the human form and the charm of graceful movement, when wedded to expressive speech or entrancing song, are sources of the noblest and keenest of our delights. Against opera or drama no lover of his fellows has a word to say.

When, however, for the spectacular embellishment of the performance, woman is asked to put

off that modesty which is her robe and crown, when the accessories of the exhibition are such that you would be unwilling to have one dear to you take part in it, then you are buying your pleasure with the red blood of a human heart and the stained whiteness of a sister's soul, — a price no true man will let another pay to procure for him a passing pleasure.

The real reason why a true-hearted, noble man cannot walk in the ways of licentiousness is not the selfish fear of physical contamination or social reprobation. It is because he cannot take pleasure in the banishment of a daughter from the household of her father ; in the infamy of one who might have been a pure sister in a happy home ; in the degradation of one who ought to be a wife, proud of the love of a good man and happy in the sweet joys of motherhood. On this point our social standards are still barbarous and our moral insight undeveloped. The man who has eyes to see these things as they are, the man who can realize the cost of shame and degradation to others which they involve, the man who can see this and still seek pleasure there, is a man whose moral affinities are with the bygone brutality of the Roman populace that found delight in seeing gladiators die, with the slave-drivers who forced human beings to labor with the lash. I care not how high such a man may stand in social circles. He is a man with a cold, hard, cruel, callous

heart ; a creature capable of finding a beastly satisfaction in drinking human blood. He has no part nor lot in the true nobility which flashed forth in the splendid deed of David, and finds its highest consummation in the pure, strong, loving heart of Christ.

Can pleasure, then, like riches, be redeemed and made an acceptable offering to the Lord? Is there a heaven for the pleasure-seeker and the pleasure-giver, as well as for the rich? Most certainly. Normal pleasure is the counterpart of healthy function, and blesses the giver no less than the recipient. The practice of any worthy art is ennobling, and gives more pleasure to the artist than to the looker-on. The actor, the singer, the painter, the poet, is not degraded, but uplifted, by the joy he gives. When you sail the seas or explore the wilderness, you make the skipper or the guide the sharer of your joys. And so with all the pure domestic and social pleasures that enrich the life of man. The test is so simple and clear that a fool can't miss it, though a knave may. Is the act that gives you pleasure at the same time, all things considered and in the long run, counting all the costs and consequences, a source of permanent pleasure and well-being to the other persons who are affected by it? The pleasure that fulfills this test is an acceptable offering to the Lord. All other pleasure is an abomination in his eyes. Searching and severe as this test

is, there is n't a particle of asceticism about it. It simply asks you to do to others as you would that they should do to you, or to those whom you love best. That is what it means for us to make our theatres and places of amusement, our recreations and our pleasures, an offering to the Lord.

Third, Politics. Of all the freely flowing waters of our modern civilization, there is no portion which has literally been brought to us at such risk of life and cost of blood as our political liberties and civic institutions, From Marathon and Salamis, from the Netherlands under William the Silent, from the British sailors who fired the Spanish Armada, from Cromwell's Ironsides at Marston Moor, from the plains of Abraham, from Bunker Hill and Bennington, from Quebec and Saratoga, from Trenton and Yorktown, from Shiloh and Antietam, from Gettysburg and the Wilderness, from all the brave souls who have risked their lives for liberty and law, for justice and humanity, we receive to-day the blessings they bought us with their blood.

To drink of these waters unworthily means that we receive our liberties and institutions as a mere matter of course, with no sense of gratitude to God and the brave men who gave them to us. It means that we use the greatness of our country as a means to our petty, private ends. It means that we seek for ourselves or help secure for others offices and emoluments for which we or they are unfit. It

means that by our indifference or preoccupation with our private affairs we permit others to do what we would be ashamed to do ourselves. It means that we find it, on the whole, cheaper and more economical to endure a worse government and pay a heavier tax rather than bestir ourselves to do our part toward securing efficient administration and honest government. It means that we acquiesce in corruption in elections and favoritism in appointments, and legislation by private purchase and irresponsible influence.

Now, we all tolerate a great deal of this wrongdoing; we all drink these dearly bought waters unworthily, because in times of peace and plenty the evil consequences of our misdoing are obscured. The taxes levied by public authority are heavier; the assessments imposed by party bosses are higher; the streets are filthier; life and property are less secure; the owners of franchises pay bigger dividends and the laborer pays more for his water and light and transportation; disease is more contagious, and the death-rate higher. But these evils are distributed over such wide areas and such long periods, and fall on such vast multitudes of people, that the individual scarcely feels or notices his added share. Even a War Department in time of peace and plenty may be administered on principles of personal patronage and private profit and political pull, and no great harm is manifest. It is,

however, one of the few advantages of war that it puts men and principles to the test, and with its keen-edged sword cuts out their unrighteousness and rottenness so cleanly that all men may see and understand. Then we see what privilege and pull and spoils and incompetence and inefficiency mean, not in vague, general terms, but in terms of starvation and inefficiency and disease and death. It is a wholesome thing that, now that our brief war with Spain is over, we have not a particle of animosity or resentment against the poor Spaniards who stood up at their posts and fired their bullets bravely at our breasts; but that the men whom we find it the hardest to forgive are those who failed to send up to our own brave soldiers at the front, or even in their camps, the reasonable requirements of health and healing, of vigor and efficiency. The men the nation blames most bitterly to-day are those who, in places of responsibility, where the lives and hopes of thousands of men and families, as well as the nation's fortune and honor, were intrusted to them, had the audacity to hold these tremendous responsibilities in their hands, and then — to use the mildest term the whole vocabulary of whitewash affords — failed to grasp the situation in which the lives of these men and the fortunes of the nation by their authority were placed.

If any great, lasting good shall come out of this late war, it will not be the speedy humiliation of

Spain which every one foresaw, not the sudden acquisition of remote possessions which no one had anticipated; it will be the recognition of the truth that the man who puts himself, or helps to put others, into positions of public responsibility for which he or they are unfit, is guilty of the only form of treason a great republic has to fear.

What, then, is it to drink worthily the water of our dearly bought liberties and institutions? It is simply to fit ourselves, and to hold ourselves in perpetual readiness, for the highest service to our country which we are capable of rendering; and to see to it that unfit men are not allowed to crowd out their betters from the responsibilities of public service. Let each man, to the full extent of his ability and influence, do these two things, and he will do his part to solve the still unsolved problem of republics; he will drink worthily, in this important sphere of politics, the precious water of the well of Bethlehem.

Fourth, Faith. The spiritual faith which comes to us to-day free as the water of the well was once red with martyr's blood. Through the great company of missionaries, martyrs, confessors, apostles, who were persecuted and put to death for their fidelity, we trace this faith back to the Christ who was crucified because he brought it to a mercenary, hypocritical, and hostile world. Jesus found the world believing in a pompous potentate who would

exact the last farthing of debt from his abject and superstitious subjects. He gave the belief in a loving Father who seeks the good of all his children. Jesus found men believing in the God of the Pharisee, — the God of people who think themselves better than their neighbors. He gave us the faith in the God of the lowly and the penitent. The world was seeking salvation by hardness and force. He brought it salvation through gentleness and mercy. The world believed in a taskmaster and a lawgiver. Jesus showed himself our Saviour and our friend. Jesus found cruelty, and left kindness; Jesus found lust, and left purity; Jesus found pride, and left meekness; Jesus found oppression, and left liberty. The hard, cruel, coarse, brutal, selfish, sensual world to which he came was loath to give up its hardness and greed, its sensuality and its hypocrisy. Jesus nevertheless carried his gospel of love and kindness and purity and truth right into the very camp of the scribes and Pharisees, the hypocrites and pretenders, the extortioners and tyrants. In rescuing the water of a sweeter, purer, lovelier life from the camp of the Pharisees and priests, Jesus not only risked, he actually laid down, his life. They indeed killed him, but he broke in pieces the cruel creed, the mercenary rites, the pretentious hypocrisy with which they had fenced in the well of spiritual life, and made free for all men evermore the divine forgiveness of the penitent, the divine

strength for the weak, the divine sympathy for the poor, the divine comfort for the troubled, the divine kingdom for the humble, the divine blessedness for the pure in heart. Theories of atonement may come and go; the great historic fact remains that Jesus found a world of lust and cruelty and hypocrisy and hate; that he attacked those powers of evil with all his might; that, in consequence, the evil forces of the world, the hypocrites and tyrants and extortioners, envied and hated and scourged and crucified him. Hence it is not a mere theological theory, it is a plain historic fact, that he bore the sin of the world in his own body, and bought the world's emancipation from it with his blood.

Hence for us to live the life of pride and sensuality and selfishness and sin is not only to be guilty of doing these wrong things. For us to live the life of sin when he has won for the world the life of love and service, for us to sink into the sensuality of brutes when he has shown us our fellowship with God; for us to do these things to-day, is to throw away, so far as it is in our power, the costly benefits which he has purchased for us; it is to drink unworthily the water of the well of Bethlehem; it is to make the sacrifice of Christ for us and for the world, so far as we are concerned, of none effect. It is to let him live and die for us, and then to go on in our sloth and selfishness as if no-

thing had happened, and no solemn and sacred obligation rested upon us to receive it worthily.

And to make this water of life which Jesus purchased with his blood an acceptable offering to the Lord, — that means for you and me that we shall let the precious life of purity and kindness and gentleness and courage and love, which he brought to the world, come into our hearts, transform our lives, and go forth from us to help and bless mankind.

The noble life, or, what comes to the same thing, the Christian life, you see, is a very simple thing. It consists in rising above the petty selfishness and meanness of our individual, animal nature, and making our possessions, our pleasures, our politics, our faith functional in the greater organism of society for the accomplishment of that will of God which seeks the good of man. This noble life is open to us all; and yet no man may carry into it a single penny of his wealth, a single indulgence of his appetites, a single department of his work, a single article of his creed, which has not first been offered up in service to the higher will of God and the larger good of man. Failure will be forgiven, mistakes overlooked, sins pardoned, repentance accepted, until seventy times seven, if only the noble purpose is really in the heart. The purpose, however, must be there. And that, too, not in a vague, general, sentimental way. It must be there as a definite and

earnest purpose to bring just such concrete things as money and pleasure and study and politics and society and business into functional subjection to this will of God which serves the good of man. Without such a ruling purpose controlling the concrete conduct of daily life, no man can live the noble life, no man can cross the threshold of the kingdom of God, no man can enter into the glorious fellowship of brave and chivalrous men, no man can be a follower of the great and glorious Christ.

These conditions are indeed hard ; harder for the rich than for the poor, harder for the strong young man full of vigorous physical life than for the feeble and the weak, harder for the man of position and influence in a busy city than for the hermit. But the greater the difficulty the greater the glory. And I know not by what authority I should offer you the noble life on cheap and easy terms. To be a Christian is not easy ; character is not to be bought at a bargain ; and you who know the severe terms on which excellence in business or professional life must be purchased will not expect to gain Christian character without strenuous effort and serious sacrifice. I tell you frankly that to make your money, your pleasure, your politics, and all the other relations of your daily lives functional in the great purpose of God for the blessing of mankind is a very much harder and severer thing than luxury and indulgence and indolence. And it is just because it

does call for this heroism and self-sacrifice that I commend it to you with confidence.

Let us, then, make David's noble deed the touchstone of the worth of our wealth, the purity of our pleasures, the righteousness of our public service, and the vitality of our faith. Let us betake ourselves anew to the Christ in whom this nobleness, which flashed forth for a brief moment in the rude life of David, found constant and unwavering expression. Let us use the spiritual aids without which no man can lift his life to this high plane, still less maintain it there. Let us conquer one by one the details of daily living, and win them over from servitude to our selfish and sensual desires, into the glorious liberty of that kingdom of God which is the commonwealth of man.

VIII

The Creed of a College Class

IT is the custom in the course in government at Bowdoin College to require each student to write out his individual political platform ; so that in case of future Fullers, Fryes, and Reeds we can trace the development of their opinions from their college views. One's religious creed bears much the same relation to the study of philosophy that one's political platform does to the theoretical study of government. Accordingly, I asked a class of sixty students, mostly seniors, to write out their individual creeds. In these individual creeds I asked each man to state as exactly as possible both his belief and his unbelief ; and to define, as far as possible, the sense in which he held the things in which he believed and the sense in which he rejected the things he did not believe. I then reduced these sixty creeds to a single composite creed. Into this composite creed I put everything which any student had affirmed, except what some of them had denied, — aiming in this way to get a class creed to which each individual member would assent. I distributed copies of this composite creed to each member of the class, and invited criticism and amendment. We then spent two hours

170 THE CREED OF A COLLEGE CLASS

together in discussing the articles of the creed one by one, making such modifications and concessions at each point as were necessary to secure their unanimous acceptance by the class. At the end of the second hour the creed was adopted by a unanimous vote.

Of course a creed composed in this way is by no means an ideal or model creed. Many of the individual creeds were far more positive and comprehensive than this composite creed. As showing, however, the things on which a typical college class can agree, this creed may be of interest. While many things are of necessity left out which we would like to see included, yet the fact that a typical college class can agree on as much as is included here is a sufficient assurance that the great institutions of Family, State, and Church will be safe in their hands; and that their fundamental attitude toward God, duty, and life, if not quite the traditional one, is yet positive, wholesome, and reverent. I present three creeds: one of the more conservative type, one of the more radical type, and one the composite creed agreed upon by all the class.

A CONSERVATIVE COLLEGE CREED

I believe in

1. God as the central power of the universe, present alike in the works of man and nature.

2. Christ as the truest expression of the character of God and the supreme example for man to pattern after.

3. In the Holy Ghost as that which urges man to better and higher things, and especially that which creates in the breast of man the love and trust in the Infinite and the satisfaction and peace at the knowledge of doing his will.

4. Prayer as the effective means of obtaining what is for our permanent good when coupled with the efforts and faith of the asker. Also as the surest way to keep before man's consciousness the example of Christ's life.

5. I believe in the eternal life as the survival after death of the mind of man.

6. In heaven as the knowledge that we have lived to the best of our ability after the teachings of Christ.

7. In hell as the realization of falling below our ideals through our own faults.

8. In salvation as the conscious choosing by man of the life of Christ as his ideal and pattern.

9. In the whole Bible as the inspired word of God to man. In that all that which is high and noble comes from God. Also that the Bible is, as a whole, the truest expression of God's will to man.

If perhaps some things appear to be beyond the understanding of man, and apparently contrary to

172 THE CREED OF A COLLEGE CLASS

science, I remember that science is the product of man's observation, and that there may have been extra-scientific things beyond the comprehension of man. Again, there is so much symbolism throughout the Bible that it is hard to separate it from what was intended as fact. Therefore it is possible for me to see truth in the whole of the New Testament, either actual or symbolical.

A RADICAL COLLEGE CREED

What I do not believe.

I do not believe in the doctrine of original sin, nor in the various Biblical miracles, nor in the divine conception of Jesus, nor in the doctrine of atonement, nor in the Trinity, nor do I deem it necessary to believe these in order to be a Christian.

What I do believe.

I believe in the existence of God, a divine Creator and Ruler, who is only personal to the extent that he has purposes and effects results.

I believe in the fundamental, immutable principle, Truth, akin to God, if not synonymous with God; that this Truth is the only imperishable thing in the universe, and that all other things are ephemeral.

I believe that as certain human beings have to a finite extent apprehended a bit of the Truth and

THE CREED OF A COLLEGE CLASS 173

promulgated it, they have become known as great teachers, and won followers through the inherent yet passive force of the Truth.

I believe Jesus Christ to have been the greatest of these teachers, inasmuch as he apprehended the Truth to a greater degree than all others.

I believe his doctrines to have spread, not through the agency of any active spiritual essence known as the Holy Ghost, but because of their own inherent immortality and the transitoriness of all opposition.

I believe Jesus Christ to have been divine only as he expounded the Truth, even as Confucius and Buddha, Socrates and Mohammed, may likewise be called divine, though to a less degree.

THE CREED OF THE CLASS OF 1903

I believe in one God, present in nature as law, in science as truth, in art as beauty, in history as justice, in society as sympathy, in conscience as duty, and supremely in Christ as our highest ideal.

I believe in the Bible as the expression of God's will through man; in prayer as the devotion of man's will to God; and in the church as the fellowship of those who try to do God's will in the world.

I believe in worship as the highest inspiration to work; in sacrifice as the price we must pay to

174 THE CREED OF A COLLEGE CLASS

make right what is wrong; in salvation as growth out of selfishness into service; in eternal life as the survival of what loves and is lovable in each individual; and in judgment as the obvious fact that the condition of the gentle, the generous, the modest, the pure, and the true is always and everywhere preferable to that of the cruel, the sensual, the mean, the proud, and the false.

IX

The Choice of the College Woman

ARE college women happier or unhappier than other people? This is the rather delicate and dangerous question I propose to raise. The answer is easy, but the reasons for the answer are more subtle and difficult. Inasmuch as men's answers are occasionally wrong and women's answers are invariably right, while men's reasons are predominantly right and women's reasons are occasionally wrong, I do not hope to change the opinion of any one of you about the answer to this question; but even if you all reject my answer, I may still hope to interest you in the reasons by which it is supported.

My answer would be that if college women remain college women, and try to bring the world to them, they will be very unhappy; but if they go into the world forgetting that they are different from other people they will be the happiest persons there. Some years ago we had a student who was a devoted lover of everything Greek. (This is so rare an occurrence in men's colleges to-day, that you will pardon the pride with which I mention it.) One day he fell in love, or what with men sometimes passes for the same thing, he thought he did.

He became engaged to a charming young lady. One moonlight evening as he was sitting with her on the lawn he dropped the fatal remark, "My dear, I am afraid we shall never be happy unless you learn Greek." Do you ask how it came out? The girl never did study Greek. Ten years later I visited her charming home, and found her the happiest wife and mother I have seen in many a day, but — with another man. We who had congratulated our Greek on his engagement, had been obliged to congratulate her on breaking it; and we added the comment, in which I am sure you all mentally join me, "She served him right."

This little story is about the college woman. The day of graduation marks her engagement to the world. If you say to the world as my Greek said to his fiancée, "My dear world, I am afraid we shall not be happy together unless you acquire the equivalent of a college education," the world will contrive to be happy with somebody else, and leave you very unhappy.

Perhaps you reply, "I never would be such a fool as that. Did I not say that the girl in the story served the young pedant just right, when she sent him about his business and married the other man?"

Yes. You all say that about the girl in the story, but in your own persons you will be sorely tempted to take the attitude of my young Greek. For

stripped of its setting in the moonlight on the lawn, what he said was this: "My dear, I am afraid we never shall be happy unless I keep the interests I have, and you acquire these same interests too." Now I contend that anybody, man or woman, rich or poor, married or single, educated or uneducated, who says that to the world is doomed to be deservedly miserable. And I am afraid that college graduates, both men and women, have peculiar temptations to take precisely that attitude. I am afraid that their comparative freedom from the immediate necessity for earning their living gives college women who are inclined to take that attitude a better opportunity to do so than comes to college men. That is my reason for believing that a certain class of college women are not only more unhappy than other people, but are about the most unhappy people in all the world, and that they deserve all the unhappiness they get.

On the other hand I believe that whoever says, "Dear world, I am sure I shall not be completely happy until I have made your interests mine" — whoever says that, whether man or woman, rich or poor, learned or ignorant, famed or obscure — will be growing happier and happier every day, and become one of the happiest persons in the world. I believe their education and their comparative economic freedom gives college women the best chance to take this attitude in life, and therefore

the best opportunity for achieving the highest happiness.

Inasmuch, then, as college women have more chance to choose than other people, and rather more temptation in some ways to choose wrongly, I have taken this Choice of the College Woman for my theme. Perhaps you expect me to set forth this choice as the familiar one between selfishness and service. No. If I were preaching a baccalaureate sermon, I might fall back on that; though it would be bringing coals to Newcastle to present to college women the superiority of the unselfish life. No. Deep as that moral difference is, I shall ask you to choose to-day between something deeper still. Your choice to-day is between aristocracy and democracy, — between the sense of superiority and the feeling of community, between the effort to shine and the willingness to share. In the home, in the market, in society, yes, even in charity work and in the social settlement, this deep distinction runs through all you do. Though the aristocratic attitude tends to coincide with the selfish, it is not quite identical with it. Though democracy has an affinity for service, the two terms are by no means interchangeable.

A person may be democratic in his selfishness, or aristocratic in his service. One may try to shine as a stenographer, or simply share his best with others as a statesman or an artist. Deeper than vocation,

more closely related to happiness than even morality itself, yes, even more fundamental than religion sometimes goes, is the Choice of the College Woman I to-day shall call on each of you to make. For in the last analysis it is nothing less than whether in the most comprehensive relation to your environment you stand off and say, "you and I" with the accent of implied superiority on the "I," or clasp hands with your environment in a genuine acceptance of the pronoun "we."

Inasmuch as one who takes the democratic side of this choice lays himself open to the charge of being a Philistine, partly by way of self-protection and partly because the concrete pictures of poetry bring out distinctions better than the pale abstractions of prose, I have cast the discussion in the form of a running commentary on Stephen Phillips's exquisite poem, "Marpessa;" so that my full title is, "Apollo or Idas: The Choice of the College Woman." You recall the situation. Like you Marpessa is called to choose between shining down on the world with a god above it, or sharing its toil and sorrow with a shepherd, on a level with his humble human lot.

When the long day that glideth without cloud,
The summer day was at her deep blue hour
They three together met ; on the one side,
Fresh from diffusing light on all the world
Apollo ; on the other without sleep
Idas, and in the midst Marpessa stood.

First the god, assuming the rights of the superior, sprang to embrace her. But they

Heard thunder, and a little afterward
The far Paternal voice, "Let her decide."

Then in turn Apollo and Idas, the god and the shepherd, present their suits. Precisely so these two radically different attitudes toward life confront the college woman at the noon hour of the day she graduates. Many, perhaps most of you stand ready to place the keeping of your lives in the hands of the divine Apollo. To shine down on the world with the light of literature, of music, of art, or failing that, in the gentle ministry of the social settlement, the charity organization, is the ideal to which you have devoted your future lives. This is a beautiful ideal; I know how it charms and attracts the earnest college woman. Yet in the name of the "far Paternal voice" I must ask you to listen impartially to the god and to his human rival, — I must ask you to hear the claims of this life of shining from above and the claims of the life of sharing on a level; I must set over against each other the artistic elevation of the world, or its socialistic reformation from the outside, and the simple living out of the world's homely human interests from the inside; and then ask you to choose. More than you can dream or imagine, your individual happiness through all the

coming years of life, and the estimation of college women as a class, depend on this momentous decision. First let us listen to the god, — a voice familiar to you all, and to which I am sure many of you are on the point of yielding.

Apollo says : —

“I live

Forever in a deep deliberate bliss,
A spirit gliding through tranquillity ;
Yet when I saw thee I imagined woe,
That thou, who art so fair, shouldst ever taste
Of the earth-sorrow : for thy life has been
The history of a flower in the air,
Liable but to breezes and to time,
As rich and purposeless as is the rose :
Thy simple doom is to be beautiful.
Thee God created but to grow, not strive,
And not to suffer, merely to be sweet.”

“But if thou’lt live with me, then shalt thou bide
In mere felicity above the world,
In peace alive and moving, where to stir
Is ecstasy, and thrilling is repose.”

“And I will carry thee above the world,
To share my ecstasy of flinging beams,
And scattering without intermission joy.”

“Or since thou art a woman, thou shalt have
More tender tasks :
To lure into the air a face long sick,
To gild the brow that from its dead looks up,
To shine on the unforgiven of this world :
With slow sweet surgery restore the brain,
And to dispel shadows and shadowy fear.”

Such and so persuasive is the appeal of the artistic life, the life of the social reformer. To feel that we belong above and apart; and yet that we send down an illuminating radiance, a healing effluence, — that appeals to us as something diviner than just being one of the toiling, suffering masses on whom the light is shed. To travel, and get impressions of art and music; to read, and get stores of literature and science; to give lectures, or write articles, or work out some social reform — be honest now and tell me, is not something of this sort the ideal of life that is hovering over you as the best use to which a college woman can put her college education?

Now I will not attempt to deny that there is beauty and worth in this ideal. All I ask is that, before you accept it as the highest, you hear what can be said for the humble, homely human sharing of the world's experience from within, as one of the rank and file. And since we have had the former plea in its poetic form, to be fair, let the poet plead again.

When he had spoken, humbly Idas said :
 “After such argument what can I plead?
 Or what pale promise make? Yet since it is
 In woman to pity rather than to aspire,
 A little I will speak.”

Then comes the great statement of woman's mission in the world, not as one of remote and isolated

illumination, as of a sun in the heavens, but of sympathy, enlargement, and inspiration, as of a modest common candle lighting its little sphere in the surrounding dark. It does not ask for radiance and glory to reform things from above. It pleads for the comradeship and kindness that shall lift the common human task up into its infinite and eternal significance, and make earth a part of heaven; the present the heir of all the richness of the past, and the promise of all the glory that is to come.

“I love thee then

Not for that face that might indeed provoke
Invasion of old cities ; no, nor all
Thy freshness stealing on me like strange sleep.
Not for this only do I love thee, but
Because Infinity upon thee broods ;
And thou art full of whispers and of shadows.
Thou meanest what the sea has striven to say
So long, and yearned up the cliffs to tell ;
Thou art what all the winds have uttered not,
What the still night suggesteth to the heart.
Thy voice is like to music heard ere birth,
Some spirit lute touched on a spirit sea ;
Thy face remembered is from other worlds,
It has been died for, though I know not when,
It has been sung of, though I know not where.
It has the strangeness of the luring West,
And of sad sea-horizons; beside thee
I am aware of other times and lands,
Of birth far back, of lives in many stars.
O beauty lone and like a candle clear
In this dark country of the world ! Thou art
My woe, my early light, my music dying.”

I shall not detain you to-day to draw out at length the prose equivalent of these poetic pleas. I simply place before you these two alternatives : to be a brilliant benefactress in some special way, and to be a simple sharer, in humble helpfulness, of the common human lot, lifting your little place and station by the inspiration of your culture and your kindness, instead of shedding a dazzling radiance on some vast problem of the world at large. Before leaving our poet, however, I must give you briefly the answer of his maiden, an answer which in substance I hope will be the answer of each one of you. Taking the shepherd's human hand in hers, she thus addressed the god : —

“ Fain would I know
Yon heavenly wafting through the heaven wide,
And the large view of the subjected seas,
And famous cities, and the various toil
Of men: all Asia at my feet spread out
In indolent magnificence of bloom !
Africa in her matted hair obscured,
And India in meditation plunged ! ”

“ But dearest, this,
To gild the face that from its dead looks up,
To shine on the rejected, and arrive
To women that remember in the night;
Or mend with sweetest surgery the mind.
And yet, forgive me if I can but speak
Most human words.”

“ As yet I have known no sorrow ; all my days
Like perfect lilies under water stir,

And God has sheltered me from his own wind ;
The darling of his breezes I have been."

" Yet as to one inland, that dreameth lone,
Seafaring men with their sea-weary eyes
Round the inn-fire tell of some foreign land,
So aged men, much tossed about in life,
Have told me of that country, Sorrow far."

" And most I remember of all human things
My mother ; often as a child I pressed
My face against her cheek, and felt her tears ;
Even as she smiled on me, her eyes would fill,
Until my own grew ignorantly wet ;
And I in silence wondered at sorrow."

" Out of our sadness have we made this world
So beautiful."

" To all this sorrow I was born, and since
Out of a human womb I came, I am
Not eager to forego it ; I would scorn
To elude the heaviness and take the joy."

The college woman who plunges immediately into scholarly, artistic, literary, or even into settlement or philanthropic work, though she sheds light on the problems and comforts the sorrows of others, in so doing is really shirking her own hardest problem, and eluding for herself the most trying of personal sorrows. I have not a word to say against these forms of service when rightly approached, but on the contrary the highest commendation. I simply tell you that the right ap-

proach to these things is not straight from a college commencement. College life is abnormal; it is artificially shielded. All your days "like perfect lilies under water stir." You have been these four years sheltered from God's wind, the darlings of his breezes. What have you known of the dreary drudgery that underlies the happy life of a growing family of children? What do you know of the tremendous crush of cruel competition? What do you, you who have been the special objects of hundreds of thousands of dollars of invested capital and scores of expert instructors and sympathetic advisers, — what do you know of the coldness and hardness and indifference of a world where each is supremely intent on his own selfish ends, and treats you merely as an obstruction, a rival, or at best as a tool? You must bear on your own back your share of the world-burden, and feel in your own heart your part in the world-sorrow, in normal experience within the home, the shop, the market, before you have the slightest possibility of being able profitably to shine down upon it from above with artistic radiance or social reformation. Ask any editor, and he will tell you how worthless is your poetic effusion; ask any head worker and he will tell you how superfluous your social service must be, until in some normal relation you have first learned to bear your own burden, and take your fair share of the homely toil and humdrum

discomfort of which every useful life is full. After you have borne your own share of the world's burden and sorrow, you may be promoted to express the feelings of the world in letters, or to comfort its heart in social service. But you must first serve the long apprenticeship to real life, of which as yet most of you have not the faintest conception.

Yet I would not leave the impression that joy is to be found with Apollo, and only suffering with Idas. True to life, our poet teaches us precisely the reverse. Apollo grows weary of his devotee. It is not in the power of the human mind to be perpetually brilliant. An ardent lover, Apollo is a very exacting and indifferent husband. The deeper sort of men soon learn that little real satisfaction is to be gained through either intellectual brilliancy or public service. They seek their deeper joy in simpler ways, from more homely, fireside sources.

With women the inadequacy of the literary or public life to afford real happiness is much more apparent.

Whether for man or for woman, but far more for woman than for man, true and lasting happiness is to be found not in the brilliant intellectual or social performance, but in the plain hand-in-hand walking with a comrade along the dusty streets of daily duty, and in the peaceful glades of private life. All this Marpessa has told so well in

her rejection of Apollo and her acceptance of Idas, that she shall be our final spokesman here to-day.

“ Ah, I
Should ail beside thee, Apollo, and should note
With eyes that would not be, but yet are dim,
Ever so slight a change from day to day
In thee my husband ; watch thee nudge thyself
To little offices that once were sweet.
I should expect thee by the Western bay,
Faded, not sure of thee, with desperate smiles,
And pitiful devices of my dress
Or fashion of my hair ; thou wouldst grow kind,—
Most bitter to a woman that was loved.
I must ensnare thee to my arms, and touch
Thy pity, to but hold thee to my heart.
But if I live with Idas, then we two
On the low earth shall prosper hand in hand
In odours of the open field, and live
In peaceful noises of the farm, and watch
The pastoral fields burned by the setting sun.”

“ Or at some festival we two
Will wander through the lighted city streets ;
And in the crowd I ’ll take his arm and feel
Him closer for the press. So shall we live.”

“ There shall succeed a faithful peace ;
Beautiful friendship tried by sun and wind,
Durable from the daily dust of life.”

“ But we shall sit with luminous holy smiles,
Endeared by many griefs, by many a jest,
And custom sweet of living side by side ;
And full of memories not unkindly glance
Upon each other.”

“Still like old friends, glad to have met, and leave
Behind a wholesome memory on the earth.”

You have my answer to the question concerning the happiness of college women, and the reasons therefor. In conclusion, to sum it all up in condensed and abstract form, differentiation and specialization are essential to the largest usefulness and the highest happiness. The college has made you different from other people, and fitted you for a highly useful and honorable service to the world, and thus placed the possibility of happiness within your reach.

But the consciousness of being different from other people, the sense of superiority, the disposition to look down upon them, is highly injurious to usefulness, and absolutely fatal to happiness. The aristocrat, whether his aristocracy be based on birth or wealth or station or culture, is always an unhappy man. All the pessimists and cynics, all the world-weary and the disconsolate, if you probe the secret source of their complaint, betray the fatal germ of aristocracy preying on their hearts. There is a deep reason why this must be so. Happiness and unhappiness register the sense of transition as we go out of our constant, neutral, normal state of feeling which we carry with us all the time, to some state induced in us by contact with the world. Now the modest person, the democrat, always finds in the world outside, and in the other people in it,

something as good as himself, or a little better ; consequently his sense of contact with the world is always agreeable, and registers itself in the form of happiness. The aristocrat, on the other hand, never gets anything that is better than himself ; and in the majority of his contacts he strikes what he regards as worse. Hence his chronic unhappiness, and the wail of pessimism in which he proclaims his misery to the world.

Every genuine and modest democrat, man or woman, rich or poor, learned or ignorant, beautiful or plain, famous or obscure, is bound to be predominantly happy. The laws of psychology, the nature of things, the constitution of the universe, the decrees of God, compel them to be happy. For every touch brings a thrill of sympathy ; every contact expands ; every relation enlarges ; every experience enriches ; every outlook uplifts ; every glance discovers good ; every breath draws inspiration : the whole world is ablaze with glory, and the meanest thing and the lowliest person are links that lift one into fellowship with what is felt to be better than one's self, chains that draw one toward the omnipresent throne of the Most High.

All persons who are tainted with the disease of aristocracy, whether the fancied superiority rest on birth or wealth or beauty or skill or education, whether men or women, old or young, in public or in private life, are bound to be at heart bitter,

lonely, and unhappy. All the principles of psychology, all the laws of society, all the decrees of God combine to doom them to ever-present and everlasting misery. Turn where they will, they meet what, judged by the standard they have set up within their own conceit, seems base, low, dull, stupid, uninteresting. Misery is the loathsome inside of the living sepulchre of which aristocracy is the whited exterior. There never was a man who on any ground considered himself superior to the rank and file of his fellows who was really happy. And just because woman is more sensitive to these personal relations, there never was a proud woman who was not, as the inevitable counterpart of her pride, eating her heart out in the gall of bitterness.

There is no law of nature more inevitable, no decree of God more inexorable than this, — that the democrat, with his modest sense of equality and his readiness for admiration and respect toward his fellows, must be happy ; and that the aristocrat, with his sense of superiority and habit of contempt, must be wretched. You college women have something which the rest of the world has not. Forget it, — think of the farmer, the mechanic, the clerk as your brothers ; the seamstress, the shop-girl, the factory hand as your sisters ; respect and reverence their contribution to the world as highly as you respect and reverence your own ; look forward to the

time when, after years of apprenticeship to real life, you may do your little part with something of the patient, modest, cheerful unpretentiousness and genuineness with which they already are doing theirs ; and they will welcome and appreciate you as the most exalted of their sisters ; you will be happy in your own usefulness and in the honor they will freely bestow on you and the class of women you represent.

On the other hand, if you dare to think of yourselves as superior to them, if you draw yourselves apart, if you condescend to them even to pity or to serve, if you put up the bars of intellectual and social aristocracy between them and you, they will hate you, and despise you, and ridicule you ; and the sense of your own isolation and alienation will burn itself into your soul like a withering, scorching curse. There will be no lost wretch in the slums, no downtrodden drudge in the tenements, no day laborer in the ditches, no obscure toiler at the looms with a heavier, sadder heart than you.

The choice is momentous. The issues for the individual are those of happiness or misery ; for society, whether, now that the old aristocracies of state and church are broken down, we shall have new aristocracies of wealth and culture to corrupt and embitter alike despisers and despised. The college man, for the most part to-day, becomes a democrat of necessity ; for there are not enough

aristocratic stations to go around, and the world no longer bestows a living on either hereditary or professional aristocratic pretensions. May our college women do in freedom what their college brothers do under economic compulsion! May they be the comrades of all who labor, the sisters of all who serve!

The Worth of the Womanly Ideal

MR. DOOLEY once remarked to Mr. Hennessey that in his youth he wrote a book about woman ; but when in maturer life he came to publish it he added at the end what the scientists call *Errata*, in which he requested his readers, wherever in its pages they found “is” to substitute “is not,” and wherever they found “is not” to substitute “may be,” “perhaps,” or “God knows.” Pretty much everything that has ever been said on the subject of women’s rights, whether by men or women, whether on the one side or the other, requires to-day the radical revision to which Mr. Dooley subjected his youthful manuscript.

Though individual women still suffer grievous wrongs, yet, broadly speaking, women’s rights are won. Women’s rights are all within her grasp, or at least within her reach. We can say with John Davidson : —

Free to look at fact,
 Free to come and go,
 Free to think and act,
 Now you surely know
 The wrongs of womanhead
 At last are fairly dead.

The solution of one social problem, however, prepares the way for another. Now that women can have anything they want, the question arises, What do women want? What career is best for them? In other words, the modern question is no longer one of women's rights. It has become the question of the Womanly Ideal.

When we pass from rights to ideals, when we stop asking what can women be permitted to have, and ask instead, what do women really want, then we get our answer no longer in terms of equality, but in terms of difference. The demand for women's rights got for its answer, Let us try to make men and women as nearly alike as possible; let us give them the same education and set them the same tasks; let us measure them by the same standard and pay them in the same coin. The recognition of the Worth of the Womanly Ideal will give us as its fulfillment a deepening of the differences between men and women. It will teach us to train men and women in different ways for different tasks. It will estimate their success on an entirely different scale, — offer them different rewards for success, and punish their failures by different penalties.

First, what is the difference between the economic ideal for men and that for women? The most fundamental distinction in economics is between production and consumption. The two, though dis-

tinguishable, like the convex and concave aspects of a curve, are practically inseparable. Production is for the sake of consumption. Consumption presupposes production. A person who does not share the proceeds of his production with others is a money-mad miser. The person whose consumption does not rest on production is a thieving parasite. Of course production may be vicarious ; husband and father producing for wife and children ; and consumption may be delegated, wife or daughter taking charge of the whole family expenditure.

In a broad way, subject to exceptions and qualifications to be made a little later, the manly economic ideal is the effective direction of production ; the womanly ideal is the beneficent ordering of consumption. Let us consider the womanly ideal first.

Goods are not immediately useful when produced in large quantities. Food must be prepared and served. The house must be furnished and kept in order. Cloth must be fitted to the person who is to wear it, and kept cleanly and presentable. Children must be separately reared and individually trained. Hospitality must be extended. The sick must be nursed and the aged must be cared for.

The right rendering and ordering of these and kindred services is woman's distinctive economic function. Happy is the woman who as daughter,

sister, wife, mother, finds herself excused from the task of direct economic production by the generous devotion of father, brother, husband, or son, and can find the economic justification of her life in this ministry and superintendence of the common household consumption. For it is a function just as necessary, just as useful, just as honorable as law, or banking, or commerce, or agriculture, or manufacture, or transportation. It is a function for which women are by nature and taste eminently fitted, and for which most manly men are conspicuously unfit. It is a wise distribution of economic functions which assigns in this broad way the direction of economic production to men, and the ordering of economic consumption to women.

If this beneficent ordering of consumption in and through a home which is provided by the productive labor of others is the best opportunity for the expression of the womanly ideal, what remains for the women, of whom there are some five million in this country, who are compelled to earn the whole or a portion of their living? They of course must seek employment. What sort of employment shall they seek?

In attempting to answer this question, you must allow me to make one somewhat technical distinction, — the distinction between production for immediate consumption, in a specific locality, for persons who are well known, and with whom there is

or can be established some personal relationship, on the one hand ; and production for what economists call the speculative market, “ conjunctive production,” as the German economists call it ; production which is determined by the play of world-forces, for a general market, in unrestricted competition with every other producer. Examples of production for immediate consumption are nursing, domestic service, teaching, type-writing, retailing in small communities, work for wages or salaries in factories or offices, the practice of medicine, acting, music, the management of such local industries as serve patrons personally known to the manager. In all these forms of production for immediate consumption, the fidelity, the thoroughness, the tact, the courtesy, the sympathy, the æsthetic sense and social grace of woman give her a certain advantage which partly or wholly — and sometimes more than wholly — offsets the superior physical strength of man.

These are the careers in which women who have to earn their own living, or that of persons dependent upon them, will find their best satisfaction and success. A woman can succeed in these callings ; and what is of more consequence, she can succeed with no loss of that generous interest and kindly service for others which is such an essential part of the womanly ideal. Indeed, in all these callings women contrive to become more rather than less womanly,

enlarging the circle of those whom they love and serve with true womanly devotion to include their pupils, their employers, their customers, their patrons, and their patients.

What then remains exclusively for men? From what economic activities does the womanly ideal exclude woman altogether? This exclusively masculine sphere is production on the large scale, production for the speculative market, conjunctive production; production in competition and collision with the vast, shifting, hostile, stubborn facts and forces of the world.

Here woman is doomed to financial failure if she enters the arena, and even if she should succeed financially, as in one case in ten thousand I should admit that she might, it would be at a cost to her physical health or to her personal character and womanly nature which would make her financial success more pathetic than financial failure. To this statement I of course admit the rare exception. Indeed, when I go to New York I sometimes call on a lady, an old friend of my school-days, who has made a fortune in mining, and is secretary and director of several successful mining enterprises, and whom I find as charming as ever. But then when I come back to Boston I find one of my Harvard classmates a very successful dressmaker, having made a good deal more money in this business than most of us who have followed more masculine vo-

cations. One case is just as extremely exceptional as the other, and neither invalidates the general principle that mining is on the whole a masculine, and dressmaking a feminine vocation.

These exclusively masculine vocations, such as mining, manufacturing, transportation, law, banking, commerce, wholesale trade, involve a degree of strain, a kind of contact, a sort of emotional and mental attitude which not one woman in a million can stand without either disaster or deterioration. For the producer of a general commodity comes into intense competition with everybody in his line of business. He is exposed to severe strain, enormous risk, frequent quarrels, perpetual antagonism. He must be constantly alert to adapt methods and processes to changing conditions and varying demands. He must make important decisions instantaneously; take risks by telegraph which hang in the balance between profit and loss for weeks and months; strike hard blows swiftly; deal resolutely with dishonest contractors, insolvent debtors, striking workmen, incompetent agents, unscrupulous competitors, corrupt politicians, fickle customers, treacherous friends, and secret enemies almost every day of his active business life. In this strife of contending interests, where good and bad meet on equal terms, asking no favor and giving no quarter, in the face of enmity and calumny, fraud and deception, men manage to turn out their product, and make their

enterprises a success, without a very large proportion of physical breakdowns, and without the destruction of their personal character. Under these conditions the normal woman could not succeed in more than one case in ten thousand ; and even then she would be almost sure to perish on one of the two rocks that guard this narrow passage, — nervous prostration or hardening of heart. No law to-day forbids a woman from entering these competitive careers. The womanly ideal forbids it ; and it does so on the ground that the womanly ideal is of such supreme worth, to herself and to her children, to her family and to the world, that she ought not to run the risk of losing it for the sake of the largest rewards these competitive careers hold out to the winners.

The feminine ideal, to make toil tolerable, and leisure enjoyable, and home habitable, and, in Stevenson's phrase, life livable, by the beneficent ordering of consumption, and the gentle ministry to individual persons, whether in the home or in some not too exacting and impersonal vocation, — this is so supremely precious that the woman who risks it for an attempt to imitate or rival the activities of men in conjunctive production wrongs her own soul, and in so doing robs the world of her most distinctive and valuable contribution.

In scholarship this same distinction between production and the beneficent ordering of consumption

will guide us to the distinction between the masculine and the feminine ideals. It is needless to say that the pretty ignoramus, the regular-featured nonentity, has ceased to be either the ideal women cherish for themselves, or the one which men have for them. We all agree that there should be elementary education for all women; secondary education for those whose parents can afford to give it to them; college education for those who have the financial means and physical health; graduate education for those who add to these qualifications marked capacity in some special line. Having granted these rights, the question remains, What is the ideal for women, and how does it differ from the ideal for men?

Women are larger consumers and better distributors of knowledge than men. They read more books, and get more satisfaction out of intellectual pursuits than men. Put boys and girls together in school and college, and if you are foolish enough to give them their relative rank, and to offer them prizes, the girls will win much more than their proportion. Indeed many coeducational institutions have been forced to put up some sort of protective barrier in order to give the poor boys half a chance. The problem of women's education is not, as in the case of men, to provide spurs for the flanks of laziness, and blinders against temptations to dissipation, but to devise sufficiently effective

checks and hold-backs to keep them from drafting off into intellectual and social activities the vitality which nature intrusted to them for more fundamental functions. The one danger is that woman, driven by keen intellectual ambition, and backed by an uncompromising conscience, will spend so freely of her vital forces on study, and the social interests which study stimulates, that she will lose what for her are infinitely more important, — healthy outdoor life, superabundant physical vigor, democratic interests, cheerful temper. Piti-ful beyond expression is the mistake of those women who squander the wealth of physical vitality meant for twenty generations to gain some paltry academic honor or ephemeral social success. Terrible are the penalties nature exacts, — muscular flabbiness, nervous exhaustion, sharp-featured irritability, flat-chested sterility. The over-ambitious society girl or schoolgirl who diverts into channels of her individual social vanity or intellectual ambition, during the first few years of her lifetime, what nature lent her as a trust for the benefit of future generations, is guilty of a sin against the fountain-head of humanity, a crime against the race. And the fact that this crime is being committed by thousands of the most sweet-natured, conscientious, and self-sacrificing girls in the civilized world does not in the least mitigate the heinous nature of the offense, nor will it diminish

by a single stripe the inexorable penalty which outraged nature will exact. In her own interest, in the interest of her family, and in the interest of the race, woman's education should never be permitted to intrench on perfect health, normal functions, habitual cheerfulness, contagious happiness. The high school is far more perilous than the college; and it is at this stage of their education that girls need most careful protection against the combined strain of severe mental work and absorbing social interests.

Of course standards of attainment must be maintained for women as for men. But beyond knowing whether she has passed or failed to pass the minimum requirement, no school or college girl ought to be bothered with the knowledge of whether her rank is high or low in comparison with that of other boys and girls; and she should never be tempted by the offer of a prize. These spurs, which may be necessary for indolent and conscienceless boys, are mischievous and injurious when applied to responsive and often over-ambitious girls. No trace of the competitive element should enter into the education of girls. So far as possible they should be tested by regular performance from day to day, rather than subjected to the strain of high-pressure examination periods on which their intellectual fate is supposed to hang. A larger immunity from abstruse subjects like mathematics should

be accorded to those who have no taste for these studies. They should be encouraged, wherever health seems to require it, to take a four years' course in five years ; and they should have greater freedom as to when to attend and when not to attend exercises. Healthy and happy enjoyment of study, without external stimulus, and in freedom from all competitive considerations, are the educational ideals at which high schools and colleges should aim in their dealing with girls. Boys and girls are very different, and the methods of their education should be different. What is wholesome medicine for one is fatal poison for the other. In education as elsewhere, now that equal rights have been won, differing ideals is the next stage of advance.

What, then, is the womanly as distinct from the manly ideal in scholarship? What is the beneficent ordering of intellectual consumption? It is the appreciation and appropriation of whatever is true and interesting in science, literature, art, and nature, and the interpretation and expression of these things so that they may become interesting and enjoyable to others. Intelligent conversation, oral reading, the rendering of music, certain forms of art, dramatic representation, discussion of social questions, and especially the training and teaching of children, — these are some of the intellectual services an educated woman can render ; and in many of these woman is superior to man. In cer-

tain forms of story-telling, character-delineation, and description women writers are supreme.

If this appropriation and transmission of the treasures of truth and beauty is woman's distinctive province; if more and more of this high function is being given over into woman's hands, as all our statistics of teaching show that it is, what intellectual province remains for men?

A very important, a very arduous, if less conspicuous and less popular part remains, and probably will remain almost exclusively in the hands of men,—the part of productive scholarship. By productive scholarship is meant the power to grasp as a whole some great department of human knowledge; keep abreast of every advance that is made in it; from time to time add some contribution to it, and above all so vitally to incorporate it, so vigorously to react upon it, and so systematically to organize it, that the scholar puts his individual stamp upon it, and compels whoever would master the subject to reckon with the individual form which he has given to it. Productive scholarship of this high sort is very rare, whether in men or women. Its price is very high,—in time and strength, in withdrawal from other interests and concentration upon one's chosen subject, in sacrifice of domestic and social claims.

In these days no one disputes the right of women to pursue this exacting ideal of productive scholar-

ship, no one denies that a few very exceptional women have succeeded in attaining it: enough, indeed, to supply our few women's colleges with professors who are productive scholars. This gift, rare in men, is, however, far more rare in women. Supreme in acquisition, unequaled in transmission and distribution, when it comes to this distinctively creative act, this organizing of facts in the light of the universal principles which bind them into systematic unity, women as a rule have far less of this essential of productive scholarship than men. The very tendencies which make them win more than their share of the prizes in the high school and the receptive college courses become their handicap when they enter the graduate school, and still more when they attempt to compose music, or write dramas, or produce scientific treatises, or narrate a nation's history. It is not a defect, but it is a difference. The absorption and communication of details as details make woman as a rule a better teacher in the elementary grades of teaching than man can ever be. The grasp of underlying general principles often unfits the productive scholar for elementary instruction. This differentiation of function is a decree of nature, and one which it is useless for us to fight against, and highly profitable for us to recognize, — for nineteen women out of every twenty who set before themselves the ideal of productive scholarship will be doomed to disap-

pointment. They will make vast acquisitions, and impart them to others skillfully and effectively; only the very exceptional few will achieve that organic insight, that masterly unification, which will make their contribution to the subject individual and enduring.

Still, while productive scholarship is so rare a gift in women that nothing less than the most unmistakable compulsion of genius should ever lead a woman to stake her happiness and success in life on its achievement, some women have this capacity, and as we all agree a perfect right to its exercise. Then arises the further question, Can she afford to follow this ideal, even if there is a prospect of success? Is success worth achieving, considering the high cost at which it comes? I am not speaking of the writing of stories and verses, and kindred forms of serving up nature and human experience for agreeable consumption, in which women easily and conspicuously excel. I am speaking of strictly scientific work. We have already seen what an abstraction from life, what an absorption in dry and dreary details, what a withdrawal from the lighter and gayer sides of life this usually involves for men. Knowing this tremendous cost, could you wish it for a daughter whom you love? Can you choose it for any considerable number of women? For my part, I think not. It is neither for the happiness of individual women nor for the welfare

of the world that many should set their hearts upon productive scholarship as the goal of their ambition or the test of their success.

I have in mind a woman who received, on graduation from college, the highest academic honor then attainable in this country, became a favorite pupil of learned German professors, and published an erudite treatise on the most out-of-the-way and unprofitable subject which German ingenuity could set a promising pupil to studying. She had every prospect of distinction as a grammarian and philologist. Suddenly she gave up all aspiration in this direction with the remark, "The price of productive scholarship is one few women can afford to pay," and entered heartily and enthusiastically into all womanly interests and social enjoyments. She felt that she could do either one of these two things, but could not carry both together, and she chose the womanly in preference to the scholastically productive as the better part. To be sure she continued to be a university professor for several years. From a fairly intimate acquaintance with her both before and after this change in ideal and ambition, I am confident that she lived a vastly happier life herself, and contributed a vast deal more that was of value to the world, by this deliberate abandonment of the ideal of scholarly production, and the acceptance of the ideal of giving and receiving intellectual and social enjoyment. Woman sells her

birthright for a mess of miserable pottage whenever she sacrifices her womanly ideals of perfect health for self and offspring, radiating happiness for herself and her family and friends, for academic honor, or public fame, or social distinction.

There will always be some scholarly and administrative work, some speaking on platforms, some organization of clubs, some leadership in social movements for women to do ; and there will always be raised up women who, while their hearts are set on higher and better things, will do these things brilliantly and effectively, modestly confessing to themselves and to their intimate friends that all these things are for them merely a second best. All honor to these noble women who do such manly work with no loss of loyalty to the distinctive womanly ideals.

But woe to the woman who for an instant lets herself suppose that these things in themselves are her supreme ideals, who sighs for them if she has them not, or is vain or even contented if she has them alone. In scholarship and the public life to which scholarship affords the introduction, man and woman have equally honorable though differently specialized faculties and functions ; and though in actual practice there will be considerable interchange of work, there never ought to be the slightest confusion of ideals. Men must be judged mainly by the work they do, and forgiven for what

they are not. Women must be judged for what they are, and for the happiness that radiates from their presence; and even when to what they are and what they give they add conspicuous performance, we shall continue to esteem them not for the work performed, but for the love and joy that shine through their life and work. Man's intellectual work is done like the work of a mill-stream, by conscious and deliberate direction. Woman's intellectual work is done chiefly like that of the sun, — by unconscious and unpretentious radiation.

In politics the distinction between production and consumption likewise will guide us to a true discrimination between the manly and the womanly ideal. No one to-day expects or desires woman to be a mere passive spectator of public events. Public sentiment rules the Republic; and in the formation and direction of public sentiment woman is expected to do her full share. On questions of personal and public morality, on all questions of education, on questions that affect the family, on questions of health and sanitation, on questions that involve peace or war, on questions of parks and playgrounds, on questions of child labor, on questions of honest and efficient administration, woman's interest is as great, and her influence on public sentiment ought to be as potent, as the influence of man. The woman who cares for none of these things is unfit for the distinctively domestic

duties, unworthy to train the children of the Republic.

Because at these and similar points woman feels the effects of good or bad government more intensely; because she is more sensitive to the suffering caused by bad measures and the happiness insured by good measures and good institutions, or in other words, because she is the more appreciative and discriminating consumer of the benefits which good government confers, her intelligent interest in these matters, her honest praise, her frank criticism, her individual and collective expression of judgment, are most welcome and valuable additions to the forces which make for good government and free institutions. When in social settlements she comes into close first-hand contact with the darker side of our civilization, then she speaks with an authority on certain aspects of the social problem which men, if they are wise, must implicitly obey.

More important than all this, however, is the service which modest, unassuming women render in their families and homes, by making home so sweet a place, family ties so dear a bond, that they give to country its tenderest associations and its most priceless worth; so that men count it a glorious privilege to serve and labor, and live and die to upbuild and defend their native land. If men furnish the power by which, women contribute the ends for which, the country is maintained. Though

of a different order, these quiet, silent, modest services of women are no less vital and no less honorable than the services of men in legislative halls or on the field of battle.

On the other hand, political production, the formulation of public policy, the enactment and enforcement of law, the administration of the machinery of government, the conduct of diplomacy and war, the imposition of taxes and the appropriation of revenue, the appointment and direction of the vast army of employees in the civil service is best left in the hands of men. For all this is simply business on a grand scale, complicated, however, by the corruption of spoilsmen, the heat of party strife, the vicious notion that getting something for nothing out of the public is not quite the same thing as stealing from one's neighbor.

All this is rough work. To accomplish the ideal is out of the question. The best one can do is to aim at justice, and get as much of it accomplished as the men one has to deal with and the conditions under which one has to work will permit. Mistakes are unavoidable, compromises are inevitable, association with corrupt and dishonest men unescapable.

Now the plain fact is that men can bring a fairly decent order out of this moral chaos, and they can do it without serious impairment of their personal character. Between standing out for an impossible abstract perfection, on the one hand, and letting

evil go unhindered and unpunished, men know how to steer a middle course which gives good government and just laws on the whole, and puts a limit if not an end to fraud and corruption.

Women as a rule, by the very fineness of their nature, the sharpness of their moral distinctions, the uncompromising character of their personal likes and dislikes, are unfitted for this task of getting the best that is practically attainable out of conditions where abstract insistence on the ideal best often only amounts to practical surrender to the actual worst. I should admit rare exceptions here as everywhere. But not one woman in ten thousand is by nature fitted to enter this arena without either injury to the public or else hardening and deterioration for herself.

The separation of production and consumption — of efficient cause by which and of final cause for which the Republic is maintained — is grounded in an eternal distinction of nature which runs infinitely deeper than any question of merely formal right. The arrangement by which women mould sentiment, and men cast and count the ballots that register it, by which men make laws and women inspire the loyalty and self-control that obeys them, by which women give to institutions a sacredness which makes men glad to lay down their lives in their defense, is a wise and beneficent arrangement; and any tinkering of men or meddling of women

to bring about a change or confusion of these functions will involve a weakening of men and a coarsening of women, and tend toward the deterioration of society and the downfall of the state.

In politics, as in business and scholarship, the question is not one of abstract rights. The only foundation of right is the good. If women would be happier, and make happier homes, if they could contribute a refining influence to politics without becoming themselves coarsened and hardened by dwelling in the atmosphere of selfishness and strife, if unrestricted participation in politics was what any considerable number of sane women wanted for themselves, or any sane men wanted for their wives and sisters and daughters, of course they could have it for the asking. But the work to be done, the conditions under which it must be done, are so foreign to the true feminine ideal, and the feminine ideal is of so much more value to the country and to the world than any poor, ineffectual attempt to imitate the masculine ideal ever could be, that we may confidently trust that the day when women will desert the feminine for the masculine contribution to the political life of the country is put farther off by every attempted agitation in its behalf. The more woman's true contribution to national preservation, national integrity, and national honor is rightly appreciated, the more all sane men and wise women will unite in the determination that it shall never

be abandoned or exchanged for the slight and dubious addition she might make to political legislation and administration. The more we respect and honor woman, the more we shall understand that she already has what, if a different, is a coördinate part and privilege in determining the character and destiny of the Republic.

The masculine and the feminine ideals are equally precious; and we respect and preserve their preciousness, not by merging them into a neutral and colorless identity, but by emphasizing to the utmost the deep distinctions between them. You confer no favor upon two mountains by filling up the valley between them, but rather reduce them both to the dead level of a monotonous and uninteresting tableland. In industry and education, in politics and in religion, our aim henceforth should be not toward a stupid equality, with interchange of imitated functions, but toward differentiation, — giving as far as possible the direction and control of economic production to strong and forceful men, and the superintendence and ministry of consumption to wise and gentle women; giving for the most part the hard, dry task of scholarly investigation and formulation to the absorbing and protracted toil of men, and the appreciation of results and the impartation of established knowledge to the quick wits of women; giving the strife and turmoil, the compromise and diplomacy of politics to the firm will and sound

judgment of men, and the things that make a country worth living and dying for to the warm hearts of our women.

Still though thus clearly distinguishable, like the convex and concave aspects of our curve, these two are inseparable. Each requires the grafting upon it of the virtues of the other to make itself complete. When we are once assured that the boy is strong, sturdy, brave, resolute, a hard worker, a fierce fighter, a close thinker, a clear reasoner, then the more æsthetic grace and social charm he inherits from his mother, or borrows from his own or other people's sisters, the better. But after all we really weigh and measure him in terms of the manly ideal; and no adventitious feminine accomplishments can save him from our contempt, if he has given in exchange for them aught of masculine ruggedness and manly power to make his will effective in the hard world of stubborn physical facts and hostile human forces.

Precisely so, when once we are assured that the woman holds the womanly ideals of modest ministry, generous sympathy, unselfish service and unnoted sacrifice closest to her heart, then we are glad if to these she adds business efficiency, scholarly attainments, public influence. All we insist upon is simply this: that as the manly ideal is so essential to man that in comparison with it for him all feminine graces and embellishments are but as the dust

in the balance, so for woman the womanly ideal is the one thing needful ; and however much she may add to it in the way of masculine achievement, the womanly ideal remains to the end the only and all-sufficient condition of her real happiness and her highest usefulness ; her unique and supreme claim to personal friendship and affection, to social consideration and esteem. So precious to woman herself, so priceless to the world, is the inalienable worth of the womanly ideal.

XI

The Earnings of College Graduates

THE value of a college education cannot be measured in money. No graduate would give up what his college education has done for him, if offered two or three times his present remuneration in exchange. To do so would be selling a large part of his soul. Neither does any worthy graduate select his vocation mainly with a view to the remuneration it will bring. He chooses the vocation which appeals to his capacity and interest.

Still the pecuniary aspects of college education and professional success are interesting, and may serve to reassure persons who for themselves or their children choose college and vocation on higher grounds. I have asked such of the graduates of Bowdoin College as were willing to do so to give me their annual earnings, their class, and their vocation. Of those who are engaged in remunerative employment 774, which is about half the number of graduates in such employment, have replied. The replies give earnings, not income, — which in most cases would be considerably more. Those whose earnings are largest, for obvious reasons were most reluctant to reply. Although several are earning more than \$17,000, none who were earning

more than that amount replied. In the case of journalism the number engaged in that profession is too small to make the returns valuable ; and the fact that there are two or three exceptionally successful editors in this small number gives to the results in that profession a more optimistic aspect than wider induction would confirm. While returns from half the graduates of a single college are not conclusive, yet in a general way they indicate the pecuniary value of a college education, and the relative remuneration to be obtained in different professions.

The table gives the result classified by decades, and also by vocations. Vocations represented by not more than ten persons, like civil engineering and farming, are classified as miscellaneous. Since the first ten years are hardly a fair test, I have added to the averages for each decade, and for the total period, the average for those who have been out of college more than ten years. This latter average is the most instructive. It shows that, after the first ten years, medicine leads, with an average remuneration of \$4687. Law comes second, with \$4577. Journalism third (though as explained this is probably misleading), with \$4271. Business fourth, with \$3790. Banking fifth, with \$3718. Government Employment sixth, with \$3230. Miscellaneous pursuits seventh, with \$2867. Education eighth, with \$2258. The Ministry ninth

TABLE SHOWING EARNINGS OF GRADUATES ARRANGED BY DECADES AND VOCATIONS

Years out of College.	Law.		Medicine.		Ministry.		Education.		Journalism.		Business.		Banking.		Government Employment.		Miscellaneous.		Total.	
	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.	No.	Ave.
1-10	39	\$1,344	24	\$1,913	25	\$1,131	97	\$1,082	6	\$1,258	47	\$1,453	11	\$1,417	9	\$1,522	23	\$1,387	281	\$1,312
11-20	33	2,796	26	3,827	16	1,628	45	1,794	2	2,150	28	3,266	3	6,100	6	1,953	9	1,683	168	2,616
21-30	33	4,126	25	5,471	10	1,605	25	2,685	2	2,400	18	3,942	5	3,020	1	2,300	17	2,262	136	3,586
31-40	17	7,470	9	5,872	12	1,271	16	2,474	1	10,000	4	8,550	2	2,500	1	2,400	7	6,793	69	4,838
41-50	26	5,333	3	2,667	22	1,801	18	2,511	2	5,400	8	3,413	1	2,500	7	2,964	5	1,550	92	3,267
51-60	6	5,383	1	2,850	8	1,134	4	2,813			3	2,433			4	6,050	2	2,900	28	3,313
Total	154	3,758	88	3,923	93	1,444	205	1,702	13	2,882	108	2,773	22	2,567	28	2,681	63	2,327	774	2,614
Out of College over Ten Years.	115	4,577	64	4,687	68	1,559	108	2,258	7	4,271	61	3,790	11	3,718	19	3,230	40	2,867	493	3,356

222 EARNINGS OF COLLEGE GRADUATES

and last, with \$1559. The average earnings of the 493 persons reporting who have been out of college more than ten years is \$3356.

Medicine is the profession in which one may acquire considerable earning power most quickly, though the earning capacity of the lawyer holds out better in the later years.

In law, medicine, journalism, business, and miscellaneous pursuits the best period is from thirty to forty years out of college ; that is, between the ages of fifty and sixty. In the ministry, on the other hand, this period, with the exception of the first and last years, is least remunerative of all.

While in the earlier years the college graduate has, like other people, a hard struggle financially, earning on an average only \$1312 during the first ten years ; yet after that time he earns much more than the average man of good heredity and good opportunities who has not had a college education, and his earning power holds out well through life.

XII

A Great College President

CONSIDERED merely as a literary product, the collected educational addresses of President Eliot, published in book form, are in no wise remarkable. The unit of his style is the word; that is always exact, always weighty. Hence inscriptions and characterizations where heroic achievements are cast into a sentence or a scholarly career is coined into a phrase, he is incomparable. In "Educational Reform" there is an occasional gem like this: "Two kinds of men make good teachers, — young men and men who never grow old." For the most part, however, we get plain truths plainly stated, with little of that magic power to light up present facts with glowing reminiscences of kindred facts and fancies drawn from far-off lands and days, and to set the sentences to throbbing in rhythmic sympathy with the pulsations of the thought, which makes literary form as precious as the substance it conveys. Nor is the sum total of ideas set forth so very great. One who undertakes to read the collection through consecutively is soon reminded of the jury lawyer's remark, "Reiteration is the only effective figure of speech."

Nevertheless, this book marks with absolute pre-

cision our one great educational epoch. For the author is no mere essayist or orator. As we flock to hear Nansen's lectures, not for their literary charm or the range of new information they convey, but because we want to see the man who flung his ideas in the face of incredulous geographical societies, and built them into the Fram, and froze them into the ice floe, and drifted on them month after month, and drove them into his dogs in that last desperate dash for the pole, — so here we see the man who for thirty critical years, as prime minister of our educational realm, has defied prejudice, conquered obstacles, lived down opposition, and reorganized our entire educational system from top to bottom. As Wordsworth said of his French revolutionary friend, Beaupuis, we feel that our educational institutions are

standing on the brink
 Of some great trial, and we hear the voice
 Of one devoted, one whom circumstance
 Hath called upon to embody his deep sense
 In action, give it outwardly a shape,
 And that of benediction, to the world.

The one supremely eloquent feature of these essays and addresses is the dates they bear. To appreciate their significance, it is necessary to recall briefly educational history since he became President of Harvard. Our first witness shall be the Harvard Catalogue for the year 1869-70.

There is a single set of requirements for admission: the traditional Latin, Greek, and mathematics, with so much ancient history as, in the words of the President, "a clever boy could commit to memory in three or four days." Though some dozen electives are offered in each of the last three years, yet the backbone of the curriculum consists of prescribed studies supposed to be equally essential and profitable for all. Among the many things required of Freshmen are Champlin's "First Principles of Ethics" and Bulfinch's "Evidences of Christianity." "The Student's Gibbon, about twenty selected chapters," "Stewart's Philosophy of the Mind, about 350 pages," and "Cooke's Chemical Philosophy, about 180 pages," are among the half-dozen things all Sophomores are compelled to learn. "Bowen's Logic, 313 pages, Reid's Essays (selections), Hamilton's Metaphysics, 300 pages, and Lardner's Optics, chapters i-vii, xiii, and portions of chapter xiv," are required of all Juniors. In the first term of Senior year the requirements are, "Philosophy, Bowen's Ethics and Metaphysics, Bowen's Political Economy, Modern History, Guizot's and Arnold's Lectures, Story's Abridged Commentaries on the Constitution;" and in the second term, "History, Hallam's Middle Ages, one volume, Religious Instruction, Political Economy, Bowen's finished." It is not so much the extent as the nature of these requirements —

the large place given to metaphysics, and that of a single school in dogmatic form, finally narrowed down to the single learned author in charge of the department ; the specification of the precise number of pages and fractions of a chapter ; the fact that instruction in science is primarily concerned with pages and chapters anyway ; and the notion that whether in one book or many a subject like political economy can be " finished " — that makes us rub our eyes and look twice at the title-page, to see if this indeed can be a catalogue of Harvard under President Eliot.

Against this hide-bound uniformity, this dead prescription, this dogmatism of second-rate minds, this heterogeneous aggregate of unrelated fragments of instruction, elementary from beginning to end, by which, as he says, " the managers of American colleges have made it impossible for the student to get a thorough knowledge of any subject whatever," the young President hurled his ideas of liberty in the choice of studies ; absolute freedom of investigation in teacher and taught ; science by first-hand observation and fresh experiment and careful induction ; philosophy and religion by candid criticism of all proposed solutions of the problems of the spiritual life ; the supreme worth of the differences of individuals from one another in aptitude for acquisition and capacity for service. This, which has been one of his greatest contri-

butions to education, was not so hard a task to accomplish at Harvard as it would have been elsewhere; for a respectable beginning had already been made, and the needed funds for its development were forthcoming; yet it was not without hard and steady fighting for each inch of ground that the principle was finally established throughout the college, when the Freshman work became largely elective in 1884. The triumph of the principle in the matter of requirements for admission, with all the added reality and life that it brings to secondary instruction, did not find complete acceptance with the faculty until 1897.

In the meantime President Eliot was fighting the same battle in behalf of the colleges of the country at large. Though wielding the enormous power and resources of Harvard with tremendous vigor, and making every move redound to her glory and advantage, he has ever had the most generous desire that others should share in whatever good thing Harvard has wrought out. Doubtless his mode of tendering his assistance has been open to misunderstanding on the part of those who did not know the man. Year after year, from 1870 down to 1888, he went into the Association of New England Colleges, pointing out to the representatives of sister institutions the defects of prescription and the blessings of freedom. A single specimen of the frankness he was wont to exercise in the pre-

sentation of this theme is preserved in an essay now reprinted from the "Century Magazine" for 1884, in which he says: "No knowledge of either French or German is required for admission to Yale College, and no instruction is provided in either language before the beginning of the Junior year. In other words, Yale College does not suggest that the preparatory schools ought to teach either French or German, does not give its students the opportunity of acquiring these languages in season to use them in other studies, and does not offer them any adequate opportunity of becoming acquainted with the literature of either language before they take the Bachelor's degree. Could we have stronger evidence than this of the degraded condition of French and German in the mass of our schools and colleges?" Inasmuch as men like President Porter and President Seelye were not always able to appreciate the disinterested devotion to the true welfare of their respective institutions which President Eliot was wont thus to manifest on all occasions, the meetings of the Association of New England Colleges were often quite animated, in the days when this reform was being extended from Harvard to her sister institutions. To these meetings he has always come early, and he has stayed late; bringing with him definite topics for discussion, and urging his associates to some positive educational advance. In

1894 he urged in the Association, and later repeatedly elsewhere, the establishment of a common board of examiners which should hold examinations at two or three hundred points throughout the United States, and whose certificates should be accepted by all the coöperating institutions. Although a large number is desirable for such coöperation, he proposed to start with five colleges besides his own. And yet not five institutions could be found sufficiently ready to coöperate in such a vital and far-reaching scheme for elevating secondary education throughout the country, and saving us from the Dead Sea of superficiality. So very rare, even in educational institutions, is the disposition to put the interests of the community first, and to find the true interest of a particular college in generous devotion to these objective ends, that even the disinterestedness of this measure was suspected in quarters which ought to have been above the capacity for such suspicion.

At the very first President Eliot took in hand the improvement of professional training. In 1869 he found the Medical School little more than an irresponsible commercial venture. There were no requirements for admission; attendance was required for two courses of lectures only, brief in themselves, and still farther abbreviated by the failure of the great majority of students to attend during the summer term. A student who passed successfully

five out of nine oral examinations, of a few minutes' duration each, received a diploma; although as came out in the discussion of this matter in the Board of Overseers, he might not know the limit of safety in the administration of morphine, and one had actually killed two early patients in consequence. As the President says, "Under this system young men might receive the degree of Doctor of Medicine who had had no academic training whatever, and who were ignorant of four out of nine fundamental subjects." At his suggestion, the financial administration of the school was placed at once in the hands of the treasurer of the university; the course of instruction was extended to three years of two equal terms at which attendance was required; the course was made progressive throughout the three years; laboratory work was added to the didactic lectures; and written examinations were distributed through the three years, all of which each student was required to pass. By 1874 the students were divided into three classes, with rigid requirements for promotion. In 1877 physics and Latin were required for admission. To these requirements additions have repeatedly been made; so that now candidates must present a degree from a reputable college or scientific school unless admitted by special vote of the faculty in each case. In 1892 the course was extended to four years. Since 1888 the elective principle has been recog-

nized in the latter part of the course. President Eliot's influence has done much to raise the profession of medicine from the refuge of "uncultivated men, with scanty knowledge of medicine or of surgery," to a position in which it is fully worthy of his high tribute when he says, "It offers to young men the largest opportunities for disinterested, devoted, and heroic service."

The Harvard Law School in 1869 was another illustration of the remark which President Eliot made in an address at the inauguration of President Gilman: "During the past forty years the rules which governed admission to the honorable and learned professions of law and medicine have been carelessly relaxed, and we are now suffering great losses and injuries, both material and moral, in consequence." Dean Langdell describes the condition as follows: "In respect to instruction there was no division of the school into classes, but with a single exception all the instruction given was intended for the whole school. There never had been any attempt by means of legislation to raise the standard of education at the school, nor to discriminate between the capable and the incapable, the diligent and the idle. It had always been deemed a prime object to attract students to the school, and with that view as little as possible was required of them. Students were admitted without any evidence of *academic* acquirements; and they were sent out

from it, with a degree, without any evidence of *legal* acquirements. The degree of Bachelor of Laws was conferred solely upon evidence that the student had been nominally a member of the school for a certain length of time and had paid his tuition fees, the longest time being one and a half years." At once a new course was established, and an examination was held for the degree. Early in the next academic year the first recorded faculty meeting was held ; and of the 198 meetings regularly held during the succeeding twenty-four years, the President of the university presided at all but five. In 1877 the course of study was extended to three years, and the tuition fee was raised to \$150. Since 1896 only graduates of approved colleges have been admitted as candidates for the degree.

The Divinity School in 1869 was a feeble institution, to which only six pages were assigned in the university catalogue ; requiring no academic preparation beyond " a knowlege of the branches of education commonly taught in the best academies and high schools." Only five of the thirty-six students had received a degree of Bachelor of Arts or Master of Arts, whereas six needy persons who were recipients of such degrees could have \$350 apiece each year for the asking ; and a fund yielding from \$150 to \$200 apiece was divided among all applicants in the regular or partial course, regardless of ability or scholarship. The five professors were all

adherents of a single sect. President Eliot from the first contended that "the gratuitous character of the ordinary theological training supplied by denominational seminaries is an injury to the Protestant ministry. It would be better for the profession, on the whole, if no young men could get into it except those whose parents are able to support them, and those who have capacity and energy enough to earn their own way. These tests constitute a natural method of selection, which has long been applied in the other learned professions to their great advantage. Exceptions should be made in favor of needy young men of decided merit and promise, to whom scholarships should be awarded on satisfactory tests of ability and character." Accordingly, in the year 1872-73 the promiscuous distribution of aid to all applicants in equal parts was stopped, and scholarships were established in its place. In order that "the mendicant element in theological education might be completely eliminated, and the Protestant ministry put on a thoroughly respectable footing in modern society," the President recommended in 1890 that the tuition fee be raised to the same amount as in other departments of the university. After much doubt and misgiving on the part of the friends of the school, this bold step was taken in 1897. Since 1882 a college education or its equivalent has been required of candidates for the degree of Bachelor of Divinity.

The President has always been the earnest advocate of absolute freedom in theological study. In his essay *On the Education of Ministers*, he commends the scientific spirit in these terms: "This spirit seeks only the fact, without the slightest regard to consequences; any twisting or obscuring of the fact to accommodate it to a preconceived theory, hope, or wish, any tampering with the actual result of investigation, is the unpardonable sin. It is a spirit at once humble and dauntless, patient of details, passionless but energetic, venturing into pathless wastes to bring back a fact, caring only for truth, candid as a still lake, expectant, unfettered, and tireless." All this, and much more to the same effect, is admirable, and highly needed as a prophylactic against what he calls "the terrible stress of temptation to intellectual dishonesty" which besets the clerical profession. Yet when, as in his report for 1877-78 he went so far as to say, "The various philosophical theories and religious beliefs should be studied before, and not after, any of them are embraced," he fell into a one-sided intellectualism which gave some occasion for the widespread distrust of Harvard's religious leadership that prevailed twenty-five years ago. Intimate acquaintance with him, however, is pretty sure to convince one of the truth of the remark which President Tucker once made, speaking of persons engaged in college work, "President Eliot is the most religious man among

us." His earnest efforts in establishing the present system of religious worship at Harvard, together with the influence of the philosophical professors in their doctrines of the glory of the imperfect, the world of description and the world of appreciation, and the will to believe, have done much to correct the earlier tendency, and to reëstablish Harvard in the confidence of the community, as a centre of virtue and piety as well as of learning and research.

President Eliot is a Unitarian, and glories in the critical candor and intellectual honesty of which, until quite recently, that denomination had held too nearly a monopoly. Yet he is too broad and fair-minded to think for an instant of leaving the theological department or the religious life of a great national university in the hands of a single sect, least of all in the hands of a sect which represents but one tenth of one per cent of the nation's population. Under his administration the Divinity School has become unsectarian in reality, as it always was in name.

The condition of graduate work at Harvard in 1869 can be inferred from the fact that the degree of Master of Arts was given to all graduates of three years' standing and of good moral character on payment of five dollars; and no other degree beyond the Bachelor's was offered. The new President at once gave notice that the granting of

Master's degrees on these easy terms would cease in 1872. After a year or two of fruitless experimentation with "university lectures," in 1872 the degrees of Master of Arts, Doctor of Science, and Doctor of Philosophy were offered on definite and exacting terms. In his report for 1876-77 we find the President quietly dropping the remark that, "for a few years to come, it is to the improvement of this department of the university that the attention of the governing boards may be most profitably directed." As a result of that profitably directed attention, Harvard performed successfully the arduous and delicate task of rearing a great graduate school on the broad foundation of undergraduate work, without injury, but with positive inspiration and elevation to the latter. It was the surplus intellectual resources accumulated under the elective system which made possible that unprecedented educational feat. The graduate school has never resorted to the expedient of hiring its students by guarantees of large pecuniary assistance. President Eliot was among the first to perceive the danger of repeating the error which has resulted in overcrowding the clerical profession with weaklings of all sorts, and thus lowering the tone of manliness and self-respect in the men who are to be college professors. There has been no disposition to turn out Doctors as a matter of course after three years of mechanical work at some trivial

task devised for the express purpose of grinding a thesis out of it. The school has steadfastly refused to confer the degree of Doctor on any man who has not grasped the subject as a whole, as well as developed some special aspect of it sufficiently to render him a competent, and, so far as training can contribute to it, an inspiring teacher. Not every one of the Doctors it has turned out will make a successful professor; but the system is not one which, by concentrating half-trained men almost exclusively on the narrowest of technical investigations, makes failure the rule, and success the miraculous exception.

Having thus started every department of the university upon the pathway of reform, President Eliot next turned his attention to the secondary schools. As far back as his report for the year 1873-74, he had called attention to "the great importance to the colleges and to the community that the way be kept wide open from the primary school to the professional school, for the poor as well as for the rich," and had said, "The desired connection between the secondary schools and the colleges might be secured by effecting certain changes in the requisitions for admission to college on the one hand, and in the studies of the existing high schools on the other. But this is not the place to discuss these changes at length."

Seventeen years later he found the place for

such discussion at the meeting of the National Educational Association, in a speech which led to the formation of the famous Committee of Ten, of which he was appointed chairman. By his prodigious labors on that committee he secured national sanction for his long-cherished views as to the worthlessness of short, scrappy information courses; the earlier beginning in the elementary schools of such subjects as algebra, geometry, natural science, and modern languages; "the correlation and association of subjects with one another by the programmes and by the actual teaching;" emphasis on the supreme importance of thorough training in English; the doctrine that secondary schools supported at public expense should be primarily for the many who do not pursue their education farther, and only incidentally for the few who are going to college; the doctrine of the equal rank, for purposes of admission to college, of all subjects taught by proper methods with sufficient concentration, time allotment, and consecutiveness; and the corollary thereof, that college requirements for admission should coincide with high-school requirements for graduation. At the same time he secured the working out in detail of the practical application of these measures by representative experts in all the departments involved; thus giving to secondary education the greatest impulse in the direction of efficiency, variety, serviceableness, and vitality it

has ever received, and winning the grandest victory ever achieved in the field of American education.

Nor did he stop there. Finding by actual experiment with schoolboys brought to his own study that the entire reading-matter included in a grammar-school course covering six years could be read aloud in forty-six hours, and that the work in arithmetic done during two years by giving one fifth of all the time of the school to it could be done by a bright boy fresh from the high school in fifteen hours ; finding by actual reading of everything used in that grammar school that the entire course was dull and destitute of human interest, consisting chiefly in the exercise of mere memory on such relatively useless matters as the capitals and boundaries of distant States ; finding that the children and the community alike were suffering irreparable harm because the peculiar natural aptitudes of individual children were not appealed to, and consequently not developed, — in 1891, after considerable discussion, and in spite of some opposition directed from the headquarters of conservatism, he secured from the Association of New England Colleges, at its annual meeting at Brown University, an indorsement of his plan for “shortening and enriching the grammar-school course.” The recommendations then made covered five points : elementary natural history in the earlier years, to be taught by demonstrations

and practical exercises, with suitable apparatus, rather than from books ; elementary physics in the later years, to be taught by the laboratory method ; algebra and geometry at the age of twelve or thirteen ; and French, German, or Latin, or any two of these languages, from and after the age of ten. During the years immediately following he was busy advocating these reforms in primary and secondary education ; always resting his argument on the supreme importance, both for the children and for the community, that each individual's peculiar powers should be trained to the highest degree, as a means to that equality of opportunity which is the glory of a true democracy, and that diversity of talent and function which is essential to happy and useful social life ; and pointing out that these reforms were quite as much in the interest of the many whose education ends at the grammar school or high school as for those who go to college.

In psychological analyses of the process of "apperception" and the related realm of "child study," President Eliot has had but scanty interest. He has rather taken it for granted that if the table is spread with a feast of sufficient freshness and variety, and presided over by a tactful and generous host or hostess, the children can be counted on to get enough to eat ; even if no prepared food is provided in powdered form, and although the hostess herself may be unable to delineate the precise

details of the physiological processes of mastication, swallowing, digestion, and assimilation. His emphasis has always been upon the substance of the truth presented, not on the form of its apprehension by the receiving mind.

There have been men in our colleges more gifted than President Eliot in supplementing scanty resources and meagre equipment by the power of direct personal inspiration ; though in recent years he has made great gains in this respect, and his addresses on enlistment at the outbreak of the Spanish war, and on a memorial for those who died, rank among the most influential and uplifting counsels ever given by college officers to college students. And while other presidents may have been more expeditious in creating culture out of cash, he has never forgotten that " a quarter of one per cent means a new professorship ; " has never been backward either in creating financial demands or in searching for fresh sources of supply. Yet he has never been in the least degree servile toward rich benefactors, but rather inclined to err in the direction complained of by an early benefactor whom Professor Dunbar reports as saying of the President, " He comes to me for my money and my advice ; and, like the women in the Scripture, the one is taken and the other left."

Even in the brief sketch of reforms given above, the reader must have noticed the long lapse of time

between the first prophecy of a reform and its fulfillment. When President Eliot was elected, George S. Hillard, meeting him on the street, said to him, "Do you know what qualities you will need most out there at Harvard?" President Eliot replied that he supposed he would need industry, courage, and the like. "No," said Mr. Hillard. "What you will need is patience — patience — patience." So it has proved. All these reforms have required ten, twenty, or thirty years for their accomplishment. Yet this marvelous patience has been no idle waiting for the lapse of time, but the steady pressure of one who was confident that he was right, and sure that, if urged at every opportunity, the right would gain adherents and ultimately prevail.

President Eliot's reforms have all been rooted in principles and purposes which at bottom are moral and religious. He has gone up and down the whole length of our educational line, condemning every defect, denouncing every abuse, exposing every sham, rebuking every form of incompetence and inefficiency, as treason to the truth, an injury to the community, a crime against the individual. To his mind, intent on making God's richest gifts available for the blessing of mankind, a dull grammar school is an instrument of intellectual abortion; uniformity in secondary schools is a slow starvation process; paternalism and prescription in

college is a dwarfing and stunting of the powers on which the prosperity of a democratic society must rest; superficial legal training is partnership in robbery; inadequate medical education is wholesale murder; dishonest theological instruction is an occasion of stumbling more to be dreaded than "that a great millstone should be hanged about his neck, and that he should be cast into the depths of the sea."

Such has been the work of this educational reformer. What, then, has been his reward? For the first twenty-five years he was misunderstood, misrepresented, maligned, hated with and without cause. It may be that it is an essential element of the reformer's make-up that, in order to hold firmly and tenaciously his own views against a hostile world, he should be somewhat lacking in sensitiveness, and at times appear to take a hostile attitude toward those who differ from him. This, at any rate, seems to have been characteristic of President Eliot during the early years of his long fight for educational reform. In later years, now that most of his favorite reforms are well launched, and his services in their behalf are acknowledged with gratitude on all sides, there has been manifest a great change, amounting to the kindest appreciation of temperaments widely different from his own. Even in the days of his apparent hardness he was never known to cherish personal animosity on account of

difference of views. At the time when the fight was hottest in his own faculty, meeting an assistant professor, most outspoken in antagonism to all his favorite measures, who had received a call to go elsewhere, he said to him, "I suppose you understand that your opposition to my policy will not in the slightest degree interfere with your promotion here." Partly owing to the triumph of his views even in the minds of most of his old opponents who survive, partly owing to the change which the years with their increasing cares and sorrows have wrought in the man himself, he has come to be universally trusted, admired, and loved by all who know him well. Yet his chief reward has been that which he commended to another, "the great happiness of devoting one's self for life to a noble work without reserve, or stint, or thought of self, looking for no advancement, hoping for nothing again."

No one can begin to measure the gain to civilization and human happiness his services have wrought. As compared with what would have been accomplished by a series of conservative clergymen, or ornate figure-heads, or narrow specialists, or even mere business men such as by the uninformed he has most erroneously sometimes been supposed to be, his leadership has doubled the rate of educational advance not in Harvard alone, but throughout the United States. He has sought to

extend the helping hand of sympathy and appreciation to every struggling capacity in the humblest grammar grade; to stimulate it into joyous blossoming under the sunshine of congenial studies throughout the secondary years; to bring it to a sturdy and sound maturity in the atmosphere of liberty in college life; and finally, by stern selection and thorough specialization, to gather a harvest of experts in all the higher walks of life, on whose skill, knowledge, integrity, and self-sacrifice their less trained fellows can implicitly rely for higher instruction, professional counsel, and public leadership. In consequence of these comprehensive reforms, we see the first beginnings of a rational and universal church, not separate from existing sects, but permeating all; property rights in all their subtle forms are more secure and well defined; hundreds of persons are alive to-day who under physicians of inferior training would have died long ago; thousands of college students have had quickened within them a keen intellectual interest, an earnest spiritual purpose, a "personal power in action under responsibility," who under the old régime would have remained listless and indifferent; tens of thousands of boys and girls in secondary schools can expand their hearts and minds with science and history and the languages of other lands, who but for President Eliot would have been doomed to the monotonous treadmill of

formal studies for which they have no aptitude or taste; and, as the years go by, hundreds of thousands of the children of the poor, in the precious tender years before their early drafting into lives of drudgery and toil, in place of the dry husks of superfluous arithmetic, the thrice-threshed straw of unessential grammar, and the innutritious shells of unrememberable geographical details, will get some brief glimpse of the wondrous loveliness of nature and her laws, some slight touch of inspiration from the words and deeds of the world's wisest and bravest men, to carry with them as a heritage to brighten their future humble homes and gladden all their after-lives. In such "good measure, pressed down, shaken together, running over," has there been given to this great educational reformer, in return for generous and steadfast service of his university, his fellow-men, his country, and his God, what, in true Puritan simplicity, he calls "that finest luxury, to do some perpetual good in this world."

XIII

*The Personality of the Teacher*¹

SOME people can teach school and other people can't. Some teachers have good order, as a matter of course, as soon as they set foot in a school class-room. Other teachers can never get anything more than the outward semblance of decorum, try as hard as they will; and often cannot get even that. Some teachers the scholars all love. Other teachers they all hate.

Some teachers a superintendent or president will jump at the chance to secure after a five minutes' interview. Others, equally scholarly, equally experienced, equally well equipped with formal recommendations, go wandering from agency to agency, from one vacant place to another, only to find that some other applicant has secured or is about to secure the coveted position.

For nearly twenty years I have had to employ teachers every year, and to recommend teachers to others. I have seen many succeed, and some fail. But I have never seen a success that could

¹ A more complete account of the philosophical principles here condensed and applied to the specific problems of the teacher may be found in *From Epicurus to Christ*, published by the Macmillan Co.

be accounted for by scholarship and training alone. I have never seen a failure that I could not account for on other grounds. What is it, then, that makes one teacher popular, successful, wanted in a dozen different places ; and another equally well trained, equally experienced, a dismal failure where he is, and wanted nowhere else ?

The one word that covers all these qualities is personality ; that is the thing all wise employers of teachers seek to secure above all else. In colleges for men in New England it is absolutely imperative. In elementary and secondary schools, in colleges in other sections of the country, a teacher with serious defects of personality may be carried along by the momentum of the system, and the tact of superintendents and presidents. But in a men's college in New England a professor with seriously defective personality is simply impossible. The boys will either make him over into a decent man by the severest kind of discipline, or else they will turn him out. I have seen them do both more than once. A man who is egotistical, insincere, diplomatic, mean, selfish, untruthful, cowardly, unfair, weak, is a person whom New England men students will not tolerate as a teacher. No amount of knowledge and reputation, no amount of backing from the administration, can save him. On the whole, I am glad that this is so. It makes the responsibility of selecting professors tremendous.

But, on the whole, it secures in the end a better type of men for college professors than we should be likely to get if the office could be held on any easier terms.

Now, personality is very largely a matter of heredity. Some people are born large-natured; other people are born small-souled. The former are born to succeed; the latter are born to fail in any work in which personality counts for so much as it does in teaching. People with these mean natures and small souls never ought to try to teach. They ought to get into some strictly mechanical work where skilled hands count for everything and warm hearts count for nothing.

Still, personality, though largely dependent on heredity, is in great measure capable of cultivation. If it were not, it would be useless for me to talk about it here. Some teachers would be foreordained to succeed, others foreordained to fail; and nothing but the process of natural selection after actual experience could separate those who are personally fit to teach from those who are not, and never can be. Our personality is largely an affair of our own making. Those who have weak points may, by thoughtfulness and resolution, strengthen them; and those who are naturally strong, by effort may grow stronger still. How this may be done is what I am to try to tell. Fortunately, it is not a new story, but a very old one, at which the world has

been working a long while. To our problem of personality the world has found five answers: the Epicurean, the Stoic, the Platonic, the Aristotelian, and the Christian. I shall present these five answers in order. Some of you will doubtless find that you can apply one of these principles; others will find another principle the one of which they stand in need. I shall not undertake to make all that I say consistent. I shall be simply the mouthpiece of those five types of personality; and leave the reader to select what he needs; and reject the rest as unprofitable. These five answers in brief are as follows.

The Epicurean says: "Take into your life as many simple, natural pleasures as possible." The Stoic says: "Keep out of your mind all causes of anxiety and grief." The Platonist says: "Lift up your soul above the dust and drudgery of daily life, into the pure atmosphere of the perfect and the good." The Aristotelian says: "Organize your life by clear conception of the end for which you are living, seek diligently all means that further this end, and rigidly exclude all that would hinder it or distract you from it." The Christian says: "Enlarge your spirit to include the interest and aims of all the persons whom your life in any way affects."

Any man or woman of average hereditary gifts, and ordinary scholarship and training, who puts these five principles in practice, will be a popu-

lar, effective, happy, and successful teacher. Any teacher, however well equipped otherwise, who neglects any one of these principles will, to that extent, be thereby weakened, crippled, and disqualified for the work of teaching. Any person who should be found defective in the majority of these five requirements would be unfit to teach at all. Let us then take them in order, and test ourselves by them. First, the Epicurean!

The Epicurean gospel is summed up best in Stevenson's lines, "The Celestial Surgeon:" —

If I have faltered more or less
 In my great task of happiness;
 If I have moved among my race
 And shown no glorious morning face,
 If beams from happy human eyes
 Have moved me not; if morning skies,
 Books, and my food, and summer rain
 Knocked on my sullen heart in vain —
 Lord, thy most pointed pleasure take
 And stab my spirit broad awake:
 Or, Lord, if too obdurate I,
 Choose thou, before that spirit die,
 A piercing pain, a killing sin,
 And to my dead heart run them in.

The one thing in which the teacher on no account must fail is this which Stevenson calls "Our great task of happiness." The world is a vast reservoir of potential pleasure. It is our first business here, so says the Epicurean, for whom I am speaking now, to get at all costs, save that of overbalancing

pain, as many of these pleasures as we can. Doubtless you will say, this is a very low ideal of life. Well, I admit that there are higher ideals, for the sake of which this ideal, to a considerable extent, must be sacrificed. I admit that the mother with a sick child, the scholar with a difficult problem, the statesman in a political campaign, all of us, in fact, ought to have higher ideals, and sacrifice this ideal of pleasure to them. But you cannot sacrifice it unless in the first place you have it, and care very much for it.

If we grant that it is a low ideal, it is all the more shameful if we fall below it. And a great many teachers fall below it, and enormously diminish their usefulness in consequence. What, then, is the Epicurean ideal for the teacher? Plenty of good wholesome food, eaten leisurely in good company and pleasant surroundings. No hurried breakfasts of coffee and doughnuts ; no snatched lunches or dinners. A comfortable room where you can be quiet by yourself and not have to talk when you do not want to. Now, in the old days of boarding the teacher around, these things, perhaps, were not possible. But, in the long run, these fundamentals of a pleasant room and a good boarding-place are half the battle ; and before accepting a position a teacher should make sure that these fundamental requisites can be had. Don't save money by denying yourselves these necessities when they can be

had ; and don't stay long in any place where they cannot be had. No one can permanently be a good teacher without a background of restful quiet, and a basis of wholesome food. Next comes exercise in the open air. How many hours of every day do you spend outdoors, free from care, enjoying the sunlight, the fresh air, the fields, the flowers, the birds, the hills, the streams? To be sure, there are vocations which do not permit this. But the teacher, shut up in close air under high nervous tension for five or six hours, can and must offset all this abnormality by at least an hour or two of every school day, and more on Saturday and Sunday, under the open sky, as care-free and light-hearted as the birds that sing in the tree-tops. Are you living up to your Epicurean duties in this respect?

Of course you have games you are fond of playing. A teacher who works at such exhausting and narrowing work as instructing thirty or forty restless children, and does not counteract it by plenty of play, is not only committing slow suicide, but he is stunting and dwarfing his nature so that every year will find him personally less fit to teach than he was the year before. With walking, riding the bicycle, driving, golf, tennis, croquet, skating, cards, checkers, billiards, rowing, sailing, hunting, fishing, and the endless variety of games and sports available, a teacher who does not do a lot of them in vacations, and a good deal of them on half-holidays,

and some of them almost every day, is falling far below the Epicurean standard of what a teacher ought to do and be. Play and people to play with are as necessary for a teacher as prayer for a preacher, or votes for a politician, a piano for a musician, or a hammer for a carpenter. You simply cannot go on healthily, happily, hopefully, without it. If I should learn of any candidate for a position as professor in Bowdoin College that he did and enjoyed none of these things, though he should be backed by the highest recommendations the leading universities of America and Europe could bestow, I would not so much as read the letters that he brought. For, however great he might be as a scholar, I should know in advance that he would be a failure in the teaching of American youth. There are probably just enough exceptions to this rule to prove its truth. But even those exceptions, so far as I can think of them, are due to invalidism, for which the individuals at present are not responsible. Are you playing as much as Epicurus would tell you that you ought to play?

Do you sleep soundly, as long as nature requires, never letting the regrets of the day past nor the anxieties of the day to come encroach upon these precious hours, any more than you would that greatest of abominations—the alarm clock? Do you lie down every night in absolute restfulness, and thankfulness, and tranquillity? Do you live

in care-proof, worry-tight compartments, so that the little annoyances of one section of your life are never allowed to spill over and spoil the other sections of your lives? In short, to quote one who is our most genial modern apostle of Epicureanism, do you recognize and arrange your life according to the principle that

“The world is so full of a number of things,
That I'm sure we should all be as happy as kings”?

Have you friends with whom you spend delightful hours in unrestrained companionship? Have you books which you read for the pure fun of it? Do you go to concerts and entertainments and plays as often as you can afford the time and money? Take it altogether, are you having a good time, or, if not, are you resorting to every available means of getting one? Then, not otherwise, will you pass this first examination as to your personal fitness to be a teacher. None of us are perfect on this point. None of us are having nearly so good a time as we might. But we ought to fall somewhere above seventy or eighty on a scale of a hundred on this fundamental question. Let us hereafter mark ourselves as rigidly on this subject as we do our scholars in arithmetic and geography. They are marking us all the time on this very point; only they do not call it Epicureanism, or record the result in figures. They register it in slangy terms of their own likes and dislikes.

Second. Be a Stoic, which means keep your mind free from all worry, anxiety, and grief. You say, "That is impossible. The world is full of evils and we can't help worrying about them and being depressed by them." "Yes, you can," the Stoic tells us; for things out there in the external world never trouble us. It is only when they get into our minds that they hurt; and whether they shall be let into our minds depends entirely on ourselves. You make a mistake on Monday morning. That is an external fact to be acknowledged and corrected as promptly as possible. If it makes you nervous all Monday afternoon, and takes away your appetite Monday evening, and keeps you awake Monday night, and starts you out on Tuesday morning enfeebled, distrustful, and consequently ten times as likely to make mistakes as you were the day before, that is entirely your own affair and, if it happens, your own fault. You have allowed that external fact that ought to have been left in the outside world, where it belongs, to come in and take possession of your mind and drive out your normal mental, emotional, and physiological processes.

Stoicism is fundamentally the doctrine of apperception applied to our emotional states. Stoicism says that our mental states are what we are, that no external thing can determine our mental state until we have woven it into the structure of our thought and painted it with the color of our domi-

nant mood and temper. Thus, every mental state is for the most part of our own making. Of course this Stoic doctrine is somewhat akin to the doctrine of Christian Science. Yet there is a decided difference. Christian Science and kindred popular cults deny the external physical fact altogether. Stoicism admits the reality and then makes the best of it. For instance, the Christian Scientist with the toothache says there is no matter there to ache. The Stoic, both truer to the facts and braver in spirit, says there is matter, but it doesn't matter if there is. Stoicism teaches us that the mental states are the man; that external things never, in themselves, constitute a mental state; that the all-important contribution is made by the mind itself; that this contribution from the mind is what gives the tone and determines the worth of the total mental state, and that this contribution is exclusively our own affair and may be brought entirely under our own control. As Epicurus says, "Everything has two handles,— one by which it may be borne, another by which it cannot. If your brother acts unjustly do not lay hold of the affair by the handle of his injustice, for by that it cannot be borne; but rather by the opposite,— that he is your brother; that he was brought up with you; and thus you will lay hold on it as it is to be borne." Again, he says men are disappointed "not by things, but by the view which they take

of things. When, therefore, we are hindered, or disappointed, or grieved, let us never impute it to others, but to ourselves, that is, to our views." All this, you see, is the fundamental principle that the only things that enter into us and affect our states of thought, and will, and feeling are things as we think about them, forces as we act upon them; and these thoughts, feelings, and reactions are our own affairs, and, consequently, if they are not serene, tranquil, and happy, the fault is in ourselves.

Now, we can all reduce enormously our troubles and vexations by bringing to bear upon them this Stoic formula. There is a way of looking at our poverty, our plainness of feature, our lack of mental brilliance, our unpopularity, our mistakes, our physical ailments, that will make us modest, contented, cheerful, and serene. The blunders we make, the foolish things we do, the hasty words we say, though they, in a sense, have gone out from us, yet once committed in the external world they should be left there; they should not be brought back into the mind to be brooded over and become centres of depression and discouragement. Stoicism teaches us to shift the emphasis from dead external facts beyond our control to the live option which always presents itself within. It tells us that the circumstance or failure that can make us miserable does not exist unless it exists by our consent within our

own minds. To consider not what happens to us but how we take it; to measure good in terms not of sensuous pleasure but of mental attitude; to know that if we are for the universal law of right, it matters not how many things may be against us; to rest assured that there can be no circumstance or condition in which this great law cannot be done by us and, therefore, no situation of which we cannot be more than masters through obedience to the great law that governs all, — this is the stern and lofty law of Stoicism.

Carried too far, Stoicism becomes hard, cold, proud, and, like its popular cults of to-day, grotesque. But there is a healing virtue in its stern formula after all; and when things do not go as we should like, when people maltreat us and find fault with us, when we meet our own limitations and shortcomings, it is good for us to know that these external facts have no more power to worry us and depress us and unfit us for our work than we choose to let them have.

A teacher's life is probably more full of conscious failure, of personal collision, severe criticism, and general discouragement than almost any profession. The ends at which the teacher aims are vast and indefinite, the material is perverse and recalcitrant, the resources available are often meagre, and the outcome is always far below what one would wish. But the Stoic formula, faithfully

applied, will help us frankly to recognize these facts and at the same time to overcome them. We shall save ourselves many a troubled day and sleepless night if we learn to bring this Stoic formula to bear whenever these evils incidental to our arduous profession press too heavily upon us.

The third of the world's great devices for the development of personality is Platonism. The Epicurean tells us to take in all the pleasure we can get. The Stoic shows us how to keep out grief and pain. But it is a constant strife and struggle in either case. The Platonist bids us rise above it all. "The world," says the Platonist, "is very imperfect, almost as bad as the Stoic makes it out." We must live in this imperfect world after a fashion and make the best of it while it lasts. This, however, he tells us, is not the real world. Individual people and particular things are but imperfect, faulty, distorted copies of the true pattern of the good which is laid up in heaven. We must buy and sell, work and play, eat and drink, laugh and cry, love and hate down here among the earthly shades ; but our real conversation all the time may be in heaven with the perfectly good and true and beautiful. This doctrine, you see, is very closely akin to much of the popular philosophy which is gaining so many adherents in our day. A little of it is a good thing, but to feed on it exclusively or regard it as the final gospel is very dangerous. These

Platonists go through the world with a serene smile and an air of other-worldliness we cannot but admire; they are seen to most advantage, however, from a little distance. They are not the most agreeable to live with; it is a great misfortune to be tied to one of them as husband or wife, college or business partner. Louisa Alcott had this type in mind when she defined a philosopher as a man up in a balloon with his family and friends having hold of the rope trying to pull him down to earth. Pretty much all of the philosophy of Christian Science, and a great deal that passes for Christian religion, is simply Platonism masquerading in disguise. All such hymns as "Sweet Bye and Bye," "O Paradise, O Paradise," and the like are simply Platonic. Thomas à Kempis gives us Platonism in the form of mediæval Christian mysticism. Emerson has a large element of Platonism in all his deeper passages. In all its forms you get the same dualism of finite and infinite, perfect and imperfect; unworthy, crumbling earth-mask to be gotten rid of here on earth, and the stars to be sought out and gazed at up in heaven.

It is easy to ridicule and caricature this type of personality. Yet the world would be much the poorer if the Platonists and the mystics were withdrawn. The man or woman who at some time or other does not feel the spell or charm of this mood will miss one of the nobler experiences of life.

In spite of this warning against Platonism accepted as a finished gospel, it contains truth which every teacher ought to know and on occasion to apply. When one is walking through the forest and knows not which way to go, it is a gain sometimes to climb a tree and take a look over the tops of the surrounding trees. The climbing does not directly help you on your journey, and, of course, if you stay in the tree-top you will never reach your destination; but it does give you your bearings and insures that the next stage of your journey will be in the right direction. Now the teacher lives in a wilderness of dreary and monotonous details which shut out the larger horizon as completely as the trees of the forest. Every teacher ought, now and then, to climb the tall tree, or to leave the figure, to go away by himself and look at his life as a whole. A traveler in a Southern forest found an aged negro sitting with his banjo under a tree ten miles from the nearest settlement. In his surprise, he asked the negro what he was doing off there so far in the wilderness alone, and he replied, "I'm just serenading my own soul." Platonism teaches us to get out of the bustle and tangle of life once in a while and serenade our own souls. We need, at times, to look at ourselves in the large, to make clear to ourselves the great purpose for which we are living, and the ideal of character toward which we aspire. We need to

commune with the better self that we hope to be and take our bearings anew for the immediate journey before us. Most people get this Platonic refuge in religion ; some get it in music, some in art, some in intimate personal friendships. In some way or other every teacher should have some sphere of life apart from the daily routine in which he can dwell undisturbed and find everything serene, perfect, and complete. When one comes down, as come down one must, from these mounts of transfiguration, or, to use Plato's figure, "when one returns from the sunlight back into the cave," when one takes up again the duty and drudgery of life, though at first it will seem more impossible and irksome than ever, yet in the long run he will find a cheerfulness and serenity in the doing of these hard, homely duties which he never could have gained unless for these brief periods he had gone up into the summits where he sees the world as a whole bathed in unclouded sunshine. A teacher will hardly be able to keep his poise, his temper, and his cheerful outlook upon life without the aid in some form or other of these Platonic resources. Yet I must conclude this word about Plato as I began with a warning. It must be taken in moderate doses, and every added outlook and emotion derived from Platonic sources must be followed immediately by prompt and vigorous attention to the duties that await us at the foot of the mount. The mere Platonist who is that and nothing

more, whether he call himself mystic, monastic, Catholic, Evangelical, Protestant, Theosophist, or Christian Scientist, must remember that, though he draw his inspiration from above the clouds, the real tests of life are found on the solid earth beneath his feet. The Platonist of all these types should take to heart the lesson conveyed in Stevenson's "Our Lady of the Snows."

And ye, O brethren, what if God,
 When from heav'n's top he spies abroad,
 And sees on this tormented stage
 The noble war of mankind rage,
 What if His vivifying eye,
 O monks, should pass your corner by ?
 For still the Lord is Lord of might,
 In deeds, in deeds he takes delight ;
 The plough, the spear, the laden barks,
 The field, the founded city, marks ;
 He marks the smiler of the streets,
 The singer upon garden seats ;
 He sees the climber in the rocks ;
 To Him, the shepherd folds his flocks.

For those He loves that underprop
 With daily virtues heaven's top,
 And bear the falling sky with ease,
 Unfrowning caryatides,
 Those He approves that ply the trade,
 That rock the child, that wed the maid,
 That with weak virtues, weaker hands,
 Sow gladness on the peopled lands,
 And still with laughter, song and shout,
 Spin the great wheel of the earth about.

But ye ? O ye who linger still
 Here in your fortress on the hill,
 With placid face, with tranquil breath,
 The unsought volunteers of death,
 Our cheerful General on high
 With careless looks may pass you by.

The fourth great lesson of personality was taught the world by Aristotle. According to Aristotle, man is to find his end, not in heaven in the hereafter, but here and now upon the earth. The end is not something to be gained by indulgence of appetite with the Epicurean, by superiority to passion with the Stoic, by solitary elevation of soul with the Platonist; the end is to be wrought out of the very stuff of which the hard world around us is made. From the Aristotelian point of view nothing is good in itself; nothing is bad in itself. The goodness of good things depends upon the good use to which we put them, and the badness of bad things depends likewise on the bad use to which we put them.

From this point of view personality depends on the sense of proportion. This sense of proportion is the most essential part of a teacher's equipment. Every teacher has opportunity to do twenty times as much as he is able to do well. The important thing is to know which twentieth to do and which nineteen twentieths to leave undone. Between mastery of subjects taught, general reading, professional study, exercise, recreation, social engagements,

personal work with individual scholars, private affairs, correspondence, the regular work of the classroom, the correcting of papers, preparation of particular lessons, church, clubs, there is obviously far more draft on the teacher's time and strength than can be met with safety. Teaching is an extra-hazardous profession, so far at any rate as the nervous system is concerned. Into each of several of these lines one might put his whole energy and still leave much to be accomplished. The teacher's problem, then, is one of proportion and selection, to know what to slight and what to emphasize. The elements that enter into the problem are different in each person. Consequently, no general rules can be laid down. The teacher should have a pretty clear idea of what he means to do and be. That which is essential to this main end should be accepted at all costs; that which hinders it should be rejected at all costs. When the choice is between things which help it more and help it less, those which help it more should be taken and those which help it less should be rejected. The teacher should learn to say "No!" to calls which are good in themselves, but are not good for him. For instance, amateur theatricals are good in themselves, but no teacher who is teaching five or six hours a day can afford to give three or four evenings a week to lengthy rehearsals. Church fairs are good in themselves, but the wise teacher will leave the management of such things to

persons who have much more leisure. Church attendance on Sunday is a good thing in itself, but one service a day is as much as the average teacher can attend who would do his best the five working days of the week. Sunday-school teaching is an excellent thing in itself; but as a rule it is the one thing above all others from which the conscientious public-school teacher will most rigidly refrain. For Sunday-school teaching puts the teacher on what should be the chief day of rest into precisely the same state of nervous tension that must be maintained during the greater part of the week. Sunday-school teaching for a public-school teacher is very much the same misuse of Sunday that taking in a big Sunday washing would be for a washerwoman who had washings to do on all the other six days of the week. Making out absolutely accurate rank and reading carefully all the written work of a large class of pupils is a good thing in itself; but wise superintendents will save their teachers as much of that work as possible, and teachers themselves will understand that if anything is to be shirked this is the best place to economize nervous force. Of course, if it is done at all, it must be done honestly. But the difference between rapid glancing and quick final judgment in such matters, and minute perusing and prolonged deliberation in each case is of little advantage to the pupils in the long run, and is often bought at excessive cost of vitality and

strength of the teacher. Emphasize essentials, slight non-essentials. Do the thing that counts. Leave things that do not count undone or get them done quickly. Remember that physical health, mental elasticity, and freshness and vivacity of spirits must be maintained at all costs in the interests of the school and the scholars no less than as a matter of imperative self-preservation. The wise teacher will say to himself, "I must know the lessons I teach." "I must do some reading outside." "I must take an interest in my individual scholars." "I must keep myself strong and happy and well." "These are essential, and for the sake of these things I stand ready to sacrifice all mere red tape." "I stand ready to be misunderstood by good people who know nothing of the strain I am under." "I stand ready even to shrink and to slight minor matters when it is necessary to do so in order to do the main things well." In the great name of Aristotle, then, resolve to observe and apply this fundamental sense of proportion. Be sure that what you do is right for you, under the circumstances in which you are placed, with the definite obligations that are laid upon you. Never mind if you do not do everything that other people expect you to do; if you do not do things which, though good in themselves and right for other people to do, in your specific situation for you would be wrong. In other words, have your own individual ends perfectly clear, and accept or reject

the various calls that come to you according as they further or hinder these clearly grasped individual aims.

Now, we have four bits of advice from four of the world's greatest teachers. There remains the counsel of the greatest teacher of all. Christ says to the teacher, "Make the interests and aims of each one of your scholars your own." Whether a teacher is a Christian in the profoundest sense of the term depends not in the least on whether he is a Catholic or a Protestant, a Conservative or a Liberal. It depends on whether the teacher has his own point of view, his personal interests, and then regards the scholars as alien beings to be dealt with as the rules of the school may require and as his own personal interest and reputation may suggest; or whether in sympathy and generous interest he makes the life and problems of each scholar a genuine part of the problem of his own enlarged nature and generous heart. The greatest difference between teachers, after all, is that in this deepest sense some teachers are Christians and some teachers are not. The teacher who is not a Christian according to this definition will work for reputation and pay, — will teach what is required and rule the school by sheer authority and force. Between teacher and scholar a great gulf will be fixed; the only bridges across that gulf will be authority and constraint on the part of

the teacher, fear and self-interest on the part of the pupils. Such a teacher will set tasks and compel the scholars to do them. Here such a teacher's responsibility will end.

Precisely here, where the unchristian teacher's work ends, is where the Christian teacher's best work begins. Instead of imposing a task on the scholars, the Christian teacher sets before scholars and teacher alike a task which they together must do; the teacher is to help each scholar to do it and each scholar is to help the teacher to get this task done. It is a common work in which they are engaged. If they succeed it is a common satisfaction; if any individual fails it is a common sorrow. The Christian teacher will be just as rigid in his requirements as the unchristian teacher, but the attitude toward the doing of it is entirely different. The unchristian teacher says to the scholars, "Go and do that work: I shall mark you and punish you if you fail." The Christian teacher says, "Come, let us do this work together; I am ready to help you in every way I can, and I want each of you to help me." The Christian teacher looks forward to each pupil's future, and enters sympathetically into the plans which the child has for himself and his parents have for him.

Now undoubtedly this Christian attitude toward each scholar is pretty expensive of the teacher's time and strength. Doubtless, hitherto you have

thought me very selfish, hard-hearted, and parsimonious in the counsel I have been giving. I have told you in the name of Epicurus to get all the pleasure you can; in the name of the Stoics to shut out all superfluous griefs and worry; in the name of Plato to get above petty details and live a life of your own, apart from mere humdrum routine; in the name of Aristotle to develop a sense of proportion, to shirk and slight and exclude a thousand distractions that are well enough for other people, but which you cannot afford. But in giving all this selfish, hard-hearted, coolly calculated advice, I have asked you to save yourselves for this Christian work, which is the best worth while of all. Pour yourselves unreservedly, without stint or measure, into the lives of your scholars. See things through their eyes; feel keenly their joys and griefs. Be sure that you share in sympathy and helpfulness every task you lay upon them; that you rejoice in every success they achieve, and that you are even more sorry than they for every failure they make. Be a leader, not a driver, of your flock: for to lead is Christ-like, to drive is unchristian. The difference, you see, between the teacher who is a Christian and the one who is not, is not a difference of doctrine or ritual or verbal profession. It is a difference in the tone, temper, and spirit of the teacher's attitude toward the scholars. It is a hard thing to define, but it is

272 THE PERSONALITY OF THE TEACHER

something an experienced person can feel before he has been in a class-room five minutes. In one class-room you feel the tension of alien and antagonistic forces, the will of the teacher arrayed against the will of the scholars, and, as an inevitable consequence, the will of the scholars in latent antagonism to the will of the teacher. In another class-room there is tension, to be sure, as there ought to be, but it is the tension of one strong, friendly, united will of teacher and scholar directed against their great common tasks. The Christian spirit alone, without sufficient mental equipment and force of will, will not teach school any more than it will manage a factory or win a game of football without technical training and equipment. All this, however, I am taking for granted. Assuming these general qualifications, it may be safely said that every teacher who combines the five qualities we have been describing will find teaching a perpetual joy and will achieve a brilliant success.

Such are the five points of personality as the world's great teachers have developed them and as they apply specifically to the work of the teacher. Show me any teacher of sufficient mental training and qualifications who is unpopular, ineffective, unhappy, and I will guarantee that this teacher has violated one or more of these five principles of personality ; either he has neglected diet, exercise, rest, and

recreation, and failed to have a good time ; or else he has wasted his nervous substance in riotous worry, and spent the energy needed to make things go right to-day in regretting what went wrong yesterday or anticipating what may go wrong to-morrow ; or else he has no life of his own outside of the school and above it, from which he comes down clothed with fresh inspiration and courage to meet the duties and details of each new school day ; or else he has missed the great sense of proportion and squandered the energies which should have been devoted to the few things that are needful on a variety of burdens which the importunity of others or the false conscientiousness of himself had laid upon him ; or else, and this is by far the most common and serious cause, he has failed to merge his own life in the lives of the scholars, so that they have felt him a helper, a leader, a friend in the solving of their individual problems and the accomplishment of their common work.

On the other hand, I will guarantee perfect personal success to any well-trained teacher who will faithfully incorporate these five principles into his personal life. The teacher who is healthy and happy with Epicurus nights and mornings, holidays and vacations, at mealtime and between meals ; who faithfully fortifies his soul with the Stoic defenses against needless regrets and superfluous forebodings ; who now and then ascends with Plato the heights from

which he sees the letters of his life writ large, and petty annoyances reduced to their true dimensions ; who applies the Aristotelian sense of proportion to the distribution of his energy, so that the full force of it is held in reserve for the things that are really worth while, and finally sees in the lives of his scholars the supreme object for which all these other accumulations and savings have been made, and devotes himself joyfully and unreservedly to the common work he tries to do with them, for them, and through them for their lasting good, — this teacher can no more help being a personal success as a teacher than the sunlight and rain can help making the earth the fruitful and beautiful place that it is.

XIV

The Six Partners in College Administration

THE last decade of the nineteenth century raised the question of academic freedom in several cases: at Brown University, Chicago University, Kansas State Agricultural College, and Leland Stanford Junior University. It is not my purpose to discuss any of these cases. For every college president knows that there are many things on the inside of such questions which cannot be made to appear to the public as they really are. What one of us has not, time and again, been compelled to hold his peace while the public was making all sorts of unjust criticisms, simply because telling the whole truth would do more harm to the institution and to other persons than the criticism could do to us!

This question of academic freedom did not arise so long as the colleges were content to teach Latin, Greek, mathematics, and a little science and philosophy, for the simple reason that nobody cared much, one way or the other, what was taught about these things. Most of these subjects were so formal and dead that serious difference of opinion about them was impossible. No one cared to interfere

with the liberty of a professor to translate a passage of Virgil, to solve an equation, or to demonstrate a proposition in any way he might please. Interference with liberty comes only when the subjects taught are those for which the people care. When people felt that theological questions were most vital to their welfare, they hedged about their theological seminaries with creeds, and bound professors to teach according to the letter of the creed. In times of intense political activity, as in the Revolution and the Civil War, political opinions were the battle-ground of academic freedom. Now that economic and social questions have come to the front, it is with these that troubles have arisen. It is no accident that all four cases cited above arose in connection with utterances on economic and social questions. Theological persecutions we have inherited in connection with creeds, fast growing incredible, to which chairs of instruction are tied. The troubles at Union and Andover came from this source; and soon or late every seminary that is tied to a creed will have to face that kind of trouble. If there is less persecution of heretics to-day than formerly, we have reason to fear that indifference to the issues is the cause. Political persecution we have spasmodically in political campaigns; but the storm of protest which such persecution raises is so intense that the persecutors suffer more damage than the persecuted.

Social and economic questions, however, are destined to divide the public more sharply than ever before. Unless we can come to a clear understanding as to the mutual duties and rights of the several partners in college administration, professorships of economics and sociology will be as perilous positions in a democracy as chairs of politics ever were under an absolute monarchy, or chairs of theology in the palmy days of papal power.

Who, then, are the partners in college administration? The parties to this partnership are six. First, the founders, donors, and benefactors. Second, the State. Third, the trustees, regents, or overseers. Fourth, professors and instructors. Fifth, the students. Sixth, the constituency of the college, that portion of the public from which money and students come, and to whom the institution must look for interest, guidance, and support. The most important element in this portion of the public, which I have called the constituency of the institution, is the institution's own alumni.

To assign to each of these six parties to college administration their respective rights and duties, is the problem which we must try to solve. First, the rights and duties of founders, donors, and benefactors, the men from whom the money comes. The founder has a right to determine the general purpose and scope of the institution which he founds, subject to the approval and acceptance of

the State. He has the right to select the first trustees, and to outline in a general way the policy and procedure the new institution shall adopt. Subsequent donors and benefactors have the obvious right to satisfy themselves as to the efficiency of the trustees, and the wisdom of the policy of the institution to which they give their money. They also have the right to determine to what particular departments, within the general scope of the institution, their special benefactions shall be devoted. This is the limit of the donor's right. He may give or he may not give, but when he has given his money, it should be as completely beyond his individual control as is a thrown stone after it has left the hand. A donor has no more right to dictate what views an institution shall teach than a stockholder of a steamship company has a right to direct the pilot how he shall steer the ship to which a thousand lives have been intrusted. The moment a donor has given his money, he has entered into a partnership with the five other parties to an institution, and his rights must be limited by the rights which belong to them. Neither may he legitimately draw up a creed or statement of opinion which the professors in the institution shall be bound to teach. To do that would be like sending a boat to sea with the tiller lashed in position, and with instructions to the sailors on no account to touch it, even though the boat might be making straight for the icebergs

or the rocks. The attempt of a donor to dictate the views which a professor shall teach is to arrogate to himself the attributes of omniscience, omnipotence, and immortality, — an arrogance of which no mortal man would care to be guilty. This limitation of a donor's rights may seem severe and extreme, yet it is the foundation stone on which academic freedom rests.

A donor may indicate the general purpose to which his gift shall be devoted. He has no right to dictate the specific views which shall be inculcated under that general purpose. Wherever founders, donors, or charters have ventured to prophesy, evil has resulted. Wise as was Johns Hopkins, and great as was his gift, how much wiser he would have been, and how much more useful would have been his gift, had he not tied his institution to the uncertain fortunes of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad! Much as Clark University under its able president has been able to accomplish, it would have done five times as much if the founder had merely given his gift in cash, and turned over all questions of building, equipment, personnel, and curriculum to the president and the very competent board of trustees whom he selected. Other institutions have failed to get financial support because the founders have been supposed to carry the keys of the safe in their pockets.

Financial interference, however, is the least seri-

ous of the errors of founders and benefactors. For, as a rule, finance is the one thing in which such founders are experts. Their interference becomes intolerable and fatal the moment they attempt to dictate the specific opinions which shall or shall not be taught. It were better that a million dollars should be sunk in Boston Harbor, Lake Michigan, or San Francisco Bay, than that the donor of it should influence, in the slightest degree, the utterance of a professor at Cambridge, Chicago, or Berkeley. For an institution of learning is a partnership, and the determination of precisely what shall or shall not be taught rests chiefly with the other partners.

The second of the six partners in the college is the State. The contribution of the State consists in exemption from taxation, which increases by one third the value of productive funds, and the degree-conferring power, which gives to the graduates of the college official recognition and standing in the community. It is the duty of the State to protect the public against misdirection of funds and the cheapening of degrees. An institution founded for the propagation of alchemy, astrology, palmistry, theosophy, or Christian science would have no claim to exemption from taxation or the conferring of degrees. For some of these subjects have been proved to be without foundation; and others, to say the least, have yet to make

good their claim to public confidence. There is no reason why the public at large should contribute to the support of such institutions, or place confidence in their graduates. Consequently a charter granting exemption from taxation and the degree-conferring power to institutions of this kind would be a partnership of the State in purely private interests. Furthermore, the State should refuse charters to institutions which propose to duplicate means of instruction which are already adequate. The State should not support ten colleges when five are adequate to serve its educational needs. Again, charters should be refused to institutions which fail to give promise of adequate means for the prosecution of the work they undertake. Some indulgence doubtless is necessary to struggling institutions in new communities. On the frontier, an institution may be founded on a lot of land given to it as a means of booming the town, the buildings may be built by mortgaging the land, the professors may be employed with money raised by a mortgage on the buildings, and finally the money to prevent foreclosure may be raised from credulous donors in the East. I once visited such a college and inquired of the janitor, who was a student in the institution, as to the financial basis and prospects of the institution. He told me that it had no president, only four professors, and thirty-two students. When more closely questioned, he

confessed that of those thirty-two students, thirty were in the preparatory department. I asked him if there were any other competing institutions, and he replied that there was a State university in the city, and that a Presbyterian college was in process of erection. When asked as to the financial support of the institution, he replied that it had the entire denomination of the State behind it. I asked him how strong the denomination was in that State, and he replied that there were nine churches in the State, of which two were self-supporting. In new communities it may be necessary to encourage such infant industries by granting charters with great freedom, trusting to natural selection to weed out, in due time, the feebler ones; but in established communities it is the duty of the State to assure itself that a proposed institution will have sufficient means to give the instruction which it offers by approved methods and under competent instructors. Where strong institutions are so numerous and easily available as they are in most of our Eastern States, it is a great wrong to the community to encourage the establishment of educational weaklings, which give an inferior education to the deluded students who resort to them, and which eke out a precarious existence by systematic begging. It is the duty of prospective donors and benefactors to discriminate against these feeble and struggling institutions.

The wise donor will see that the dollar which he gives is multiplied by every dollar that the institution to which it is given already has. To give to an institution which has only one or two hundred thousand dollars of endowment is to make his gift of much less educational value than if it were given to an institution which had several millions. "To him that hath shall be given" is a law which wise friends of education should strictly observe in their gifts.

The State should refuse to grant charters for the promulgation of individual opinions and prejudices. It should not allow an institution to bind itself to teach either free trade or protection, either the gold standard or the free and unlimited coinage of silver at the ratio of sixteen to one, either imperialism or anti-imperialism, either private or municipal ownership of public-service corporations, either Trinitarianism or Unitarianism, either universal salvation or the endless punishment of the wicked, either free will or determinism, either socialism or individualism, either sacerdotalism or the independence of the local church. These are matters in which competent persons disagree. One side of these questions has as much right to be impartially presented as the other. The public, as such, has no peculiar and exclusive interest in either one; consequently the State should not enter into partnership with either party to these and kindred con-

troversies. There is, however, a way in which the views of private parties may legitimately be taught under the protection and sanction of the State. As has already been said, the founders and donors have a right to select the trustees who are to execute their trust. The State need not inquire into the views of the donors or of the trustees whom they select. The State deals with both donors and trustees as citizens ; it does not inquire whether they are individualists or socialists, protectionists or free-traders, Catholic or Protestant, orthodox or liberal. If they are sufficiently intelligent and competent to administer the trust imposed upon them, the State asks no questions about their views. Consequently, it is perfectly possible for Catholics to establish a Catholic university, controlled by Catholic trustees under the sanction of the State. The State does not thereby become a partner in their peculiar views, as it would if the requirement to teach those peculiar views were embodied in the charter of the institution. Furthermore, where the character of the institution is determined by men rather than by document, there is ample opportunity for change with changing conditions. This method of securing the teaching of special views is well recognized among us. In future charters this should be the only method of propagating special opinions which is tolerated and sanctioned by the State.

The third partner in an educational institution is the board of trustees. It is their duty to invest the funds and to devote the income of the institution to the needs for which it is established. The expert financier is an indispensable member of every such board of trustees, for the waste or misapplication of funds is absolutely fatal to the life and work of the institution.

Next in importance to the expert financier on a board of trustees is the man of broad educational ideas. This is the prime qualification of the president of the institution. It is a serious mistake to put the mere financier or the ornate figurehead or the man of popular gifts or the prominent ecclesiastic at the head of an institution. These other qualities are, indeed, desirable, but not essential, for a president. The expert financial ability may be supplied from the trustees ; but the trustees as a whole can never give the educational direction to an institution. That should be centred in one person, and that person should be the president. The president should be at the head both of the governing board and the faculty of instruction. Wherever the board of government and instruction is not thus united in one head, there is sure to creep in all the inefficiency and indirection which is represented to our minds by the word "lobbying." Our theological seminaries which have not been connected with universities until recently have, as a rule, been organ-

ized on this basis of mutual exclusion. As a result their management has been far below the level of the efficiency and the mutual understanding and good will which characterize other institutions of learning. Tied to creeds and governed by trustees who have known comparatively little of the inner working of the institution committed to their charge, these theological seminaries have lagged far behind other institutions of learning in the efficiency and harmony of their administration.

It is the duty of the trustees to elect a president and professors. In this election they are under obligation to lay aside their private interests, prejudices, and predilections, and, with due regard to the known purposes of founders and donors, to select the best available men for the chairs of instruction. This is one place in the world where influence and patronage should never be permitted to enter. In the selection of professors, the judgment of the allied departments of instruction should have great weight. The views of the faculty as a whole should be consulted; but the final authority should rest with the trustees, and should be exercised on the recommendation of the president. As a rule, a man who is indorsed by the professors in the same or closely allied departments, who is approved by the faculty as a whole, and who is recommended by the president, should be elected by the trustees almost as a matter of course; for the

president and the professors in allied departments are presumably experts in technical matters of education, while a board of trustees composed of men whose chief attention is given to business and professional life are presumably not educational experts. At the same time, the trustees always have the right for good and sufficient reasons to refuse to elect persons so nominated. While they may reject a nominee, however, it would hardly be within their province to select a candidate of their own and force him upon the faculty over the protest of the president. The ultimate responsibility for the educational conduct of the institution rests with the president. He cannot expect to have everything which he desires done by the trustees, but he has a right to insist that no professor shall be imposed upon him against his will. The election of a professor or instructor whom the president did not approve would be equivalent to a vote of want of confidence in the president, and would naturally be followed by his resignation. In municipal affairs, the tendency is more and more toward the centralization of power. This is even more desirable in the conduct of educational institutions. The men who have clear views of educational policy, who have a just sense of proportion between the several departments of instruction, who are able to judge men not merely for their individual attainments, but for their capacity to fit into a complicated intellectual ma-

chine, and contribute to the whole the most which this particular position, under the given circumstances, is able to render, are not numerous. Either a president is such a man, or he is not. If he is such a person, the wisest thing a board of trustees can do is to trust him implicitly. If he is not such a person, the sooner they get rid of him the better. Autocracy tempered by assassination is the ideal college government. By autocracy I do not mean arbitrariness or conceit or caprice. The educational autocrat should consult the reasonable claims of students, seek the advice of the faculty individually and collectively, confer with members of his board of trustees, get the views of experts in other institutions as to the qualifications of his candidate. But when his mind is made up as a result of these many inquiries and varied considerations, he has a right to expect his judgment to carry more weight than that of merchants or judges or clergymen, who, however eminent in those fields to which they have given special attention, cannot in the nature of the case have given as much consideration to the particular problem in hand as it is his prerogative and duty to do. The president has a right to have each professor in the institution one whom he has either accepted from his predecessor when he took the office, or whom he has personally approved at the time of his election. There are great risks in trusting so much power to any individual.

In the hands of an unwise man such power may harm an institution for a generation, but the policy of divided counsels and appointments without expert approval is an even greater risk, and will ruin an institution forever.

The fourth partner in a college is the faculty. It is the duty of a professor to be the master of his department. He must know his subject. Knowledge is not an aggregate of isolated propositions; it is not merely an amount of information. It is the apprehension of the whole system of relations which his department includes, ability to see each fact in the light of all the other facts to which it is intimately related, the power to grasp the whole system to which the facts belong, the capacity to bring all that is known about a subject to bear upon any problem that may arise within the department of knowledge to which it belongs. A professor must be able to teach the whole subject whenever he teaches any part of it, to answer off-hand any ordinary question that may arise in connection with it, or at least, if he cannot answer it, to point the inquirer to the sources where the answer may be found, if it is answerable. The professor is the man through whom a department of knowledge lives and thinks and speaks. If the oracle is dumb, if he evades legitimate questions or gives wrong answers without promptly acknowledging his error, he is not a real professor at all; he

is unfit for his place, and he should be removed at once. Again, if a professor knows a subject but cannot impart it as a living whole, so that it will live and grow in the minds of honest and earnest students, if he teaches the words of the book, or the mere letter of his own lectures, or the equally dead contents of his verbal memory, he is incompetent, and should be discharged. The students in our American institutions are very keen and competent critics on this point. Disorder in the class-room springs from this source more frequently than from any other. The students render a valuable service to education in helping to weed out these incompetent professors. As Dr. G. Stanley Hall says, "Youthful sentiment is right. There is nothing more worthy of being the butt of all the horseplay of ephebic wit or practical joke than an instructor from whose soul the enthusiasm of humanity has vanished, who has ceased to know and grow, and who serves up the dry husks of former knowledge and peddles second and third hand information, warmed up from year to year, rather than opening new living fountains in which the burning thirst of youth can be slaked. The latter's instincts are far wiser than they know, for iconoclasm is never better directed than against the literalist, formalist, and sophronist." It must be frankly confessed that as a rule American students, in time past, have been better judges than presidents and boards of trustees

of the fitness or unfitness of professors for their places, and that they have shown a courage, enterprise, and efficiency in the discipline of incompetent professors which presidents and trustees have sadly lacked. Like all forms of natural selection, this discipline of incompetent professors by students is merciless; but it is in the long run beneficent. It protects the colleges from a horde of morally good but intellectually weak, dull, dry, dead professors. At last the presidents themselves have discovered a way of solving this problem which combines efficiency with apparent tender-heartedness. They take advantage of the elective system to introduce young and inspiring instructors, offering courses that compete with the courses of the dead professor. It is expensive, involving temporary duplication of salaries. But in time it proves effective. The man who in open competition fails to draw his fair proportion of students, and that without resorting to "snap" courses, has the propriety of his resignation pointed out to him in terms which everybody else can read, if he cannot. And in due time the desired resignation is forthcoming. In the application of this principle, proportion, not numbers alone, has to be considered. For courses in advanced mathematics or physics never can appeal to numbers as do elementary courses in literature, history, and economics. It is noticed that whenever this automatic natural selection of professors is applied through the

elective system, there is an immediate falling off, if not an absolute discontinuance, of the artificial selection by irritation and horseplay and practical jokes on the part of the students.

Removal of professors for incompetence is a duty of trustees and presidents which they have never half lived up to. To shift this duty onto students as has been done in the past, or onto the elective system, as is being done at present, is cowardly negligence. The incompetent man should be dismissed at the first opportunity. Academic freedom demands it. For the truth has a right to be uttered through a voice competent to proclaim it. Kindness to the incompetent is treason to the truth, a betrayal of the rights of the students. Not one applicant in ten for a college professorship is fit for the position for which he applies. The most ominous sign in American education to-day is the fact that a certain class of institutions are filling up their chairs with men who have indeed met the technical requirements of graduate study, men who are capped in a thesis and gowned in a doctor's degree, but who lack the grasp of their subject as a living, growing whole.

So much for a professor's duty to his subject and to his students. His next duty is to his college. Egotism and individualism are inconsistent with the harmonious working of a faculty. Unless a man can be courteous and generous in his relations

with his colleagues and can coöperate with them harmoniously and good-naturedly in common work, he has no place on a college faculty. This matter is much more important in small colleges than in large universities. The egotist who would make interminable trouble in the small circle of a country college may be swallowed up and utilized to good advantage in a university which is large enough to ignore the personal equation of the individual. The first few years of a professor's appointment should be regarded as strictly provisional and temporary; and if incompatibility of temper develops in these early years, it is safe ground for refusal to renew the appointment. Unless a professor is prepared to do a good deal of unrewarded drudgery, and to coöperate with others in plans of which he does not altogether individually approve, and to be at times the agent of policies to which he cannot give his hearty personal assent, above all if he cannot recognize that other people have as much right to their point of view as he has to his own, he never will make the most useful member of a college faculty.

Finally, a professor is under obligation to respect the constituency of the college. Precisely what is meant by this constituency will be considered later. A professor has no right, deliberately and intentionally, to offend the friends and supporters of the institution which he is employed to serve. If

he is a believer in the gold standard, he has no right to denounce the advocates of free silver as thieves and robbers. If he is a believer in free trade, he has no right to call protectionists robbers and plunderers of the poor. If he is an anti-imperialist, he has no right to call expansionists hard names. For the adherents to these views to which he is opposed have certain rights in the institution to which he belongs. They contribute indirectly, through its exemption from taxation, to its support. They send their children to it for education. They look to it and to its graduates for counsel in professional, and guidance in public affairs. He has no right to become an agitator in behalf of views and measures which are repugnant to considerable portions of the constituency of the institution,—no right, I say, to do these things as a professor. If he wishes to do them as an individual, he of course has a perfect right to do so. But he should first hand in his resignation. In a free country every man has a right to be a martyr to any cause which he believes to be worthy of his individual sacrifice. But no professor has the right to lay the institution which he serves upon the altar of his own martyr zeal. An institution stands for the accumulated wisdom of the world. To set that wisdom forth in due proportion is its prime purpose. To sacrifice its chief function for the sake of some special view which an individual may desire to

advocate, is a wrong to the institution which no individual has a right to inflict.

In placing this limit on the utterance of professors, there is involved no unreasonable restriction of liberty. As has been said, if a man feels called upon to become an agitator, he is free to leave the university. More than that, every professor is at perfect liberty to give dignified and moderate expression to whatever views on political and social questions he may hold. In private conversation, in response to inquiry from the newspapers, even in a public speech, he is at liberty to set forth whatever views he holds and feels called upon to express. In doing so, however, he should never forget the dignity and impartiality and courtesy which his position as an intellectual servant of the public must always impose upon him. The question of academic freedom, at this point, is generally more a question of manners than of morals, more a matter of tone and temper and emphasis than of conviction. The distinction which Mr. Cleveland attempted to draw between a member of a party and an offensive partisan, is one which applies to this question of a professor's freedom of speech. Membership in a political party and frank avowal of one's views on political and social questions are perfectly consistent with the position of a professor. Neither president nor trustee nor donor has the slightest right to inquire

into a professor's views for the purposes of discipline or removal, nor to prevent the reasonable and moderate expression of such views. On the other hand, a president and a board of trustees have both the right and duty to suggest to a professor that the immoderate and aggressive and vituperative reiteration of views which are repugnant to a large portion of the constituency of an institution are inconsistent with his largest usefulness as a professor, and if he persists in such utterances, to notify him to choose between the career of an agitator and a professor. Every relationship implies both rights and duties. A professor has duties to an institution as well as rights in it. It is the duty of the president and trustees of an institution to protect a professor in his reasonable rights, and to insist on his regard for the duties and obligations which his membership in the institution involves.

The fifth partner in a college is the body of students. Academic freedom is as necessary to the students as to any other part in the university. In early college days, no provision was made for the free life of the students; accordingly they created such a sphere for themselves. By robbing the hen-roosts of neighboring farmers, translating live stock to the roofs of college buildings and establishing them in the recitation rooms, by greasing blackboards and barricading lecture-rooms, by tormenting tutors and annoying freshmen, — the students

made for themselves an artificial world in which they found the freedom that the rigid curriculum and the paternal discipline of the college refused to provide for them. A few of the wiser presidents of those days recognized the educational and spiritual necessity of such a vent for youthful spirits, and were content to perfunctorily deplore such acts, without being too strenuous in punishing culprits; but no one was wise or strong enough to provide the real freedom which alone could supersede it.

The necessity of freedom to student life has at length gained official recognition. Dr. William T. Harris in his "Psychologic Foundations of Education" says: —

"Wherever there is much pressure laid on the individual, there the reaction is violent, and pupils in a governed school must have their forms of reaction. In a college, where the pressure of prescription is far greater, the reaction produces secret societies, college songs, hazing, initiations, pranks on the citizens, etc. The study of a dead language, abstruse mathematics, and the discipline far removed from the ordinary life of the age, produces self-estrangement; and the student preserves his elasticity in the meantime by forming Greek-letter societies wherein he caricatures his daily studies, mocks them with inextinguishable laughter, and forms for himself the consciousness of a new life, — a college life of his own creation. He hazes the

members of the lower classes, and initiates them into the artificial college life by rites well planned to shock the traditions of civil order.”

In more recent years, improved laboratory facilities, the increased use of the library, the introduction of the elective system, and the advent of athletics have brought into student life a real freedom, and to that extent have superseded the necessity of that artificial freedom which, in former days, the students were compelled to carve out for themselves. No man can grow in character unless he is doing freely and gladly something which he likes to do, — something into which he can put the whole energy of his will, the whole enthusiasm of his heart. The modern college provides this freedom in study, in athletics, and in a more dignified and enjoyable social life of the students among themselves. The elective system allows and encourages the student to throw his whole energy into congenial intellectual tasks ; athletics afford him a sphere in which he can do something as well as it can be done, and reap the glory of it for himself and for his university ; life in chapter houses and college clubs gives the youth a sense of proprietorship and responsibility for the conduct of his own affairs which he never felt so long as he lived in dormitories erected by the college, and ate his meals at long tables in the college commons. If the disorders which used to mark the college dormitory life, with

the attendant breaking in of doors and smashing of furniture, if the rude manners and biscuit battles, like that at Harvard in which the historian Parkman so nearly lost his eyesight, have disappeared, it is not because they failed to perform an absolutely indispensable educational function in the college of their day, but because a wiser educational policy has provided spheres of freedom by which these rougher disciplines in independence have been superseded. We can never make men out of the boys who come to us unless, in some form or other, we give them a career in which to work out freely what is in them. Wherever prescription and paternalism undertake to domineer the life of the students, there we are sure to find either lawlessness, rebellion, and all manner of boisterous mischief, or else the product of such an institution will be a lot of good-for-nothing, effeminate, namby-pamby weaklings. The only way to escape this alternative is to provide for the students a physical, intellectual, and social life which shall be not merely what the mature, decorous judgment of their elders declares it ought to be, but, first of all, what the students earnestly and enthusiastically and freely make for themselves and cherish as their own. The question of athletics is not the question of whether this or that particular form of exercise is intrinsically good or bad, nor how it will affect the symmetry of the body as expressed on the anthropometric chart; the

question of the elective system is not the question whether a student will always choose a wiser course than a professor could mark out for him ; the question of chapter houses, society halls, and university clubs is not the question whether these things are more expensive or clannish than accommodations which the college authorities could provide in dormitories and commons. All these questions are mere phases of the deeper question whether the college shall hold its students in a state of tutelage as a benevolent empire rules its conquered provinces, or whether it shall give to them the largest liberty in the conduct of their personal affairs which is consistent with their reasonable progress in the studies they come to the institution to pursue, just as a republic grants to its constituent States the largest measure of local self-government that is consistent with the efficiency and dignity of the nation.

The sixth and final partner in a college is its constituency. This is a broad term, including the students and the homes from which they come, the geographical area from which the students are largely drawn, the social class or denominational body with which the institution is most closely allied, and, above all, the alumni of the institution, who bear its name, and whose affections and interests are bound up with its reputation and welfare. The rights of this sixth partner have already

been partially indicated in setting forth the duty of the professor to respect them. One of the chief duties of the constituency is to keep the institution abreast of the times. The other partners incline to conservatism. Founders and donors die. Foundations and charters remain unchanged. The State is conservative alike by instinct and necessity. Trustees grow old, become absorbed in other interests, and unconsciously think of an institution's needs in terms of their own experience of forty years ago. The faculty is always divided into two camps. One type of professor is content to give the same lectures, read the same passages, and teach the same subjects in the same way in which he fell into teaching them within the first five years of his professional life. The professor of this type can make a professor's chair the easiest and softest sinecure to be found in the whole range of salaried positions. Another type of professor is always living on the frontiers of investigation and research, pushing forward the boundaries of the known, and penetrating into the confines of the unknown beyond. This type of professor probably does more and harder work for the money he receives than any class of men in the whole economic world. It is the duty of the constituency of an institution to watch those subtle tendencies that bring institutions into decrepitude and premature decay, to give their cordial appreciation and approval to every effort to push the

institution to the front, to insist that dead wood shall be mercilessly cut out, that new methods shall be adopted, new equipment secured, new policies attempted as soon as educational progress elsewhere, or the consensus of educational opinion, demands them. The students are always a great help in this matter, though, as has been previously indicated, their help is often rendered in rude and brutal ways. The alumni, especially the young alumni, can render their alma mater the greatest service at this point. They should compare the courses of study in their institution with the best courses that are offered elsewhere. They should watch with jealous interest every new election and appointment, and know precisely what the election or the appointment means; whether it is on the side of retrogression or progress, whether it means improvement or decline.

The increasing representation of the alumni on boards of government in our universities and colleges is a most healthy and wholesome sign, though, of course, it needs to be guarded. The selection of alumni representatives should be made after careful and deliberate canvass, and full discussions of the qualifications and policies of candidates. No more intelligent and devoted service can be found than that which is freely and generously rendered by the representatives of the alumni of our colleges and universities. It is for the alumni, and the

friends whom they can interest, to supply our institutions of learning with the material equipment which they need, and with the productive funds for their adequate maintenance. Most enthusiastically and generously this work is being done. There is no more hopeful feature of American life to-day than the generosity with which the alumni and friends of our colleges rally to their support in time of need. Magnificent buildings, splendid equipments, munificent endowments are being given to these institutions every year, partly by men who have gained their own education from them and gladly repay the debt they owe, and partly by men who have appreciated the worth of education through their own privation of it and generously desire to give to others what they have personally known only through the sense of loss.

Academic freedom is not the simple question of whether a professor teaches or refrains from teaching this or that. As Plato says of justice, that it is the harmonious working of the several constituent elements, whether in the State or in the individual, so academic freedom is the harmonious working of the six constituent elements of the university. An institution is enslaved when any one of these parties encroaches on the rights of others. Its slavery may come from either of the six sources, — meddling founders and dictatorial donors ; a State that is either too lax or too severe in its

supervision; a president and trustees who are either arbitrary and partial, or negligent and incompetent; professors who regard their mission of agitation in behalf of their own peculiar views as prior to their obligation to the interests of the institution and the proportions of truth; obstreperous and lawless students; and, lastly, indifferent and easy-going alumni, who forget the duty they owe to their alma mater, and permit her, without protest, to lapse into fossilization.

A free institution, on the other hand, is one founded and maintained by benefactors who add to their gifts the greatest gift of all, a modest self-abnegation which recognizes that truth is larger than their private vision, and refuses to place personal preference above expert judgment; fostered by a State which is jealous for its efficiency; administered by trustees who are as single-minded in the selection of the best men for its chairs of instruction as they are for the most safe and profitable investment of their funds, and by a president who has sufficient authority to select whatever men and adopt whatever measures he finds essential to the maintenance of a consistent educational policy; manned by professors who love the truth and the institution and the students first, and themselves and their private fads last; frequented by students who are intensely interested in intellectual, social, and athletic pursuits of their own selection and

creation ; watched over by an alert body of alumni and a vigilant public, ever insisting that what has proved good elsewhere shall be instantly adopted, and that their own institution shall take its fair share of the risks of such educational experiments as are essential to educational advance.

XV

*The College*¹

THE best approach to a definition of the college is by closing in upon it from the two sides of the institutions between which it stands, the school and the university. And as in the mariner's compass not only is there a northeast between north and east, but several intervening points, so we shall find between the school and the college, a school-college, and between the university and the college, a university-college, which for our more accurate purposes we shall have to take into account. Before defining the college, let us define in order the school, the university, the school-college, and the university-college.

The school imposes the symbols of communication, together with the rudiments of science, literature, and art, on the more or less unwilling child. I know the words "impose" and "unwilling" sound hard and harsh, and will evoke a protest from the advocates of the sugar-coated education. But with all due respect for what kindergarten devices, child-

¹ Paper read before the International Congress of Arts and Science, Department 23, Section C (the college), at the Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis, Mo., September 19-24, 1904.

study, and pedagogical pre-digestion can do to make learning attractive, the school must be essentially a grind on facts and principles the full significance of which the child cannot appreciate, and which consequently must appear hard, dry, and dull. The world is so big and complex, the mind of the child is so small and simple, that the process of the application of the one to the other can scarcely be effective without considerable pain. Consequently, in the school there must be rigid discipline, judicious appeal to extraneous motives, and a firm background of unquestioned authority. I appreciate most highly all that has been done in the ways above referred to in the direction of mollifying this discipline. But in a brief definition of a great institution, the essential, not the accidental elements, the enduring features, not the latest phases of it, must be emphasized.

The university, including in that comprehensive term graduate, professional, and technical training, is the exact opposite of the school. The school brings together the large world and the child's small mind, involving the pain of mental stretching to take in materials of which there is no conscious want. The university presupposes the enlarged mind, which it applies to some small section of truth, such as law, medicine, architecture, engineering, dentistry, forestry, Latin, history, astronomy, or chemistry. This, too, is a somewhat painful

process, but its pains are of the opposite nature, due to confining the enlarged mind, full of varied human interests, to the minute details of a narrow specialty. Of discipline the university has practically nothing. It requires only intellectual results. Such moral and spiritual influences as it affords are offered as opportunities rather than imposed as requirements. Its atmosphere is absolutely free. Its professors are specialists. Its students are supposed to be men.

Having briefly defined the two institutions on either side, it might seem the proper time to present the definition of the college. But on both sides intermediary types have been evolved, which must be carefully distinguished from the college proper, — the school-college and the university-college.

The school-college admits its students poorly prepared, and gives them in the school-college the work they ought to have done in the school. Its professors are schoolmasters, teaching several subjects, mainly by the school method of recitation from the book or repetition of dictated lectures. Laboratory work is confined chiefly to prearranged illustrative material. The conduct of the students is minutely supervised by the faculty. Little or nothing inside or outside of the recitation rooms is left to the initiative of the students. A considerable proportion of the so-called colleges of the United

*

States are of this school-college type. They are inexpensive, and curiously enough the less endowment they have, the less it costs to attend them. Their graduates, unless by virtue of native wit, hardly have the breadth and initiative necessary for leadership in commercial, professional, and public life.

By the university-college, I do not mean necessarily one connected with a university. A college connected with a university may be a real college, and a university-college may be connected with no university. Its distinctive mark is the application to immature students of methods of instruction and discipline which are adapted only to the mature. Its instruction is given in large lecture courses, with little or no personal interest in his students on the part of the lecturer, or required reaction on the part of the hearer. This personal contact is sometimes supplied vicariously in the person of a graduate student, or recently fledged doctor of philosophy, who quizzes fractions of the mass at stated intervals. The information imparted is the best and most advanced. The fame of the lecturers is unsurpassed. But the appropriation of the material presented is largely optional. As the personal element in teaching is largely vicarious, learning in turn tends to become vicarious also. Printed notes, expert coaches, improvised "seminars," reduce to comparatively few hours the labor of those who

register themselves as students. Affording splendid and unequalled opportunities for the earnest and studious few, these university-colleges afford the wealthy idler the elegant leisure that he craves.

For the great majority of the students in a university-college, even athletics becomes likewise vicarious, the exertions of the elegant idler being confined mainly to the lungs and the pocketbook. In so vast a body the opportunity for social leadership and prominence in college affairs is confined to the exceptional few, impossible for the average many. The average boy of eighteen or twenty soon drifts into the irresponsibility of an unnoticed unit in the preponderating mass. Discipline in the university-college becomes practically limited to the requirement that the student shall exercise sufficient control over his animal and social instincts to maintain intense intellectual activity for two periods of two or three weeks in each college year.

By thus closing in upon the college from both sides, and marking off the institutions which come so close to it that they are often confounded with it, we have made the definition of the real college comparatively easy. We are now ready to describe its characteristic marks.

It requires as a condition of admission that the work of the school shall have been thoroughly done. Either by examination before entering, or by elimination at the first opportunity afterward, it strictly

limits its students to those who have had a thorough school training. It does this because it is impossible to give a college education to an untrained mind. It is even more essential that a student shall have done hard work before coming to college, than that he shall do hard work while in college. The previously trained mind can get a great deal out of college with comparatively little work. The mind that has not been previously well trained can get very little out of college even by hard work. This may be a stumbling-block to the school man, and foolishness to the university man; but the college man knows that in spite of these criticisms from below and from above an amount of leisure can well be afforded in college, which would be fatal in either academy or university. In order to be profitable, however, it must be the leisure of a mind previously subjected to prolonged and thorough discipline.

The method of teaching in the college is on the whole different from that of either school or university. In the school the abstract facts and principles, as laid down in approved and authoritative books, are transmitted by the teacher to the student. The individual reconstruction of those principles and facts in the mind of teacher and student, though important, is relatively less essential. If by gift of genius you get this element of individuality in either teacher or student, you are profoundly grateful; but the school can, and in a vast majority of

cases must, get on without the interpreting individuality of the teacher and the reconstructive unification of the student. I am speaking not of ideals, but of facts.

Now there is room for the schoolmaster in the college, but his sphere is very limited. In formal studies like mathematics, and the elements of such languages as have not been previously acquired, every college ought to have two or three thorough drillmasters on its faculty. There is nothing about a college atmosphere that can make analytical geometry easy, or the irregular French verb fascinating, or German prose sentences intelligible without grammar. Such school work as our requirements for admission permit to be postponed until after admission to college must be done there in the hard, exacting school way.

In the university it is the individuality of the student that counts. Not the facts in the text-book, not the insight and interpretation of the professor, but the initiative of the individual student is what the university is after. The college in the more advanced courses must introduce also a moderate degree of this university element. Most of our colleges, by the group system or by the requirement of major and minor subjects as a condition of taking the bachelor's degree, insist that something like a fourth or a third of a student's courses shall lead up to and culminate in such comparatively inde-

pendent work. In this way we give every college student a taste of real scholarly work, and discover the comparatively few who are fitted to prosecute it to advantage in the university.

The college professor, the type to which the majority of the college faculty should belong, is very different from either the schoolmaster or the university specialist. He is a man who grasps his subject as a whole, deals with each aspect of it in its relation to the whole, is able to make the subject as a whole unfold from day to day, and grow in the mind of the student into the same splendid proportions that it has assumed in his own, and who can put it to the test of practical application in matters of current interest. If he is a chemist, he is able to give expert testimony in court. If a geologist, he is able to take part in government surveys, or lead in exploration. If an economist, he is able to contribute something to the settlement of labor troubles. If a historian or professor of government, he must be able to bring ancient precedent and remote experience to bear on current complications. If a professor of the classics, he must love the masters of English prose and verse all the better for his familiarity with the ancient models, and show how much more the modern things mean when thrown on the ancient background. College students despise a professor who is so lost in his subject that he cannot get out of it, prove its worth by some

concrete application, and make life as a whole the larger and richer by the contribution he makes from his special department. He must be human, intensely interested in individuals, eager to see his favorite authors, his beloved pursuits kindle into enthusiasm the minds he introduces to them. The college professor must know his subject; he must be a competent investigator in it, and a thorough master of it. If as a badge of such mastery and aptitude for investigation he has the degree of Ph. D., all the better. But this is not essential. He must know men, and the large movements and interests of the world outside. He must present his subject, lit up with the enthusiasm of a great personality, an enthusiasm so contagious that the students cannot help catching it from him, and regarding his subject for the time being as the most compelling interest in life. He must be genial, meeting students in informal, friendly ways outside of lecture rooms, either in general social intercourse or in little clubs for the prosecution of interests related to his subject. He must have high standards of personal character and conduct, and broad charity for those who fall below them. In short, he must be first of all a man whom young men respect, admire, and imitate, and love; and then in addition he must know the subject he professes in the broad, vital, practical, contagious way described above.

The course of study in a college covers in a broad

way the main departments of language and literature, science and art, history, economics, and philosophy. At least four languages besides English: Latin, Greek, French, and German; mathematics; at least four sciences: physics, chemistry, biology, and geology or astronomy; history both ancient and modern, both American and European; both orthodox economic theory and current economic heresy, together with special study of such subjects as banking, taxation, transportation, trust and labor problems; the principles and problems of government, both national and municipal; literature studied as literature, and not merely the corpse of it in the shroud of grammar and the coffin of philology; philosophy, or the attempted answer to the perpetual problems of ontology, cosmology, conduct, and human aspiration; enough of fine art to make one at home in the great buildings and galleries of the world — these are the essentials of the college curriculum.

Each of the leading subjects should be presented in at least three consecutive courses extending over a year each, — one elementary; one or more broad, general, interesting, practical; at least one specific, intensive, involving research, initiative, and a chance for originality. These broad middle courses are the distinctive feature of the college, and they are the hardest to get well taught. For one man who can teach a college course of this nature well, you can

find ten who can teach a university specialty, and a hundred who can teach the elementary school course. But if you dare to leave out these broad, comprehensive college courses, or if you fail to get men who are broad and human enough to teach them, you miss the distinctively college teaching altogether; you have in place of the college one or another of the four institutions previously described.

These real college professors, — these men who can make truth kindle and glow through the dead, cold facts of science, who can reveal the throbbing heart of humanity through either ancient or modern words, who can communicate the shock of clashing wills and the struggle of elemental forces through historic periods and economic schedules, who can make philosophy the revelation of God, and ethics the gateway of heaven, — these men are hard to find, infinitely harder to find than schoolmasters on the one hand and specialists on the other. Yet unless you can get together at least half a dozen men of this type, you must not pretend to call your aggregation of professors a college faculty; you cannot give your students the distinctive value of a college course.

The discipline of a college is different from that of either a school or a university. The true college maintains a firm authority, and will close its doors rather than yield any essential point of moral character or intellectual efficiency to student clamor

and caprice. Yet this authority is kept well in the background, delegated perhaps to some form of student government, and is used only as a last resort when all the arts of persuasion and all the influences of reason fail. Not more than once or twice in a college generation of four years will it be necessary to draw the lines sharply, and fight out some carefully chosen issue on grounds of sheer authority.

On the other hand, the college has much of the liberty of the university; yet in such wise that it cannot be perverted into license to do whatever may seem for the time being right in the eyes of immature and inexperienced youth. Spies and threats, and petty artificial penalties, are as foreign to a true college as to a university. Yet the college does make the way of the transgressor hard, much harder than the university ever attempts to do.

What, then, is the secret, what is the method of true college discipline, which avoids both these extremes, yet secures the advantages at which both school and university aim? It is personal friendliness, intelligent sympathy, appealing to what is best in the heart of the college student. By intimate appreciation of all worthy student interests, ambitions, and enthusiasms, the college officer comes to understand by way of contrast whatever is base, corrupt, and wanton in the life of the little community, and to know by intuition the men who

are caught in the toils of these temptations. Any competent college officer can give you, if not off-hand, certainly after a half-hour's consultation, an accurate account of the character of any student in his institution; his haunts, his habits, his companions, his ways of spending time and money, and all that these involve. Where it seems to be needed, either some professor or the president has a friendly conference with the student, — bringing him face to face with the facts and their natural consequences, but making no threats, imposing no penalties, simply calling the student's attention to principles with which he is already perfectly familiar, and offering him whatever help and encouragement toward amendment friendly interest and sympathy can give. Usually the whole matter is strictly confidential between officer and student; though when this proves inadequate the aid of students likely to have influence is secured, and in extreme cases the coöperation of parents and friends at home is invoked. Information that is directly or indirectly acquired through this close sympathy with student life is never made the basis of any formal discipline whatever. A student may persist in evil ways, and be known to persist in them, and be treated by the college in no other way than he would be treated in similar circumstances by his father and mother at home. If he performs his work and avoids scandal, he may go on and gradu-

ate, precisely as he might continue to live under his father's roof. If his evil courses lead to failure in his work, or if they bring scandal upon the college through overt acts or obviously injurious influence, then he is asked to withdraw.

Such, in brief, is the spirit of college discipline. It fits neither the immature nor the mature, but youth who are passing from immaturity into maturity. It appeals to the highest and best motives, and scorns to deal with any others. It brings to bear the strongest personal influences it can summon, but deigns to use no others. It sometimes fails, but is usually in the long run successful. It presupposes absolute sincerity, perfect frankness, endless patience, infinite kindness on the part of the college officer. It is sure to be misunderstood by the general public. It takes the average student about half his college course to come to an understanding of it. It lays those who employ it open to the charge of all manner of partiality, weakness, inefficiency, from those who look at the outside facts and do not comprehend the inner spirit. But it is the only discipline that fits the college stage of development; it does its work on the whole effectively; it turns out as a rule loyal alumni, moral citizens, Christian men.

In its religious life the college should be as little as possible denominational. The narrowness of sectarianism and the breadth of the college outlook are

utterly incompatible. Denominations may lay the eggs of colleges; indeed, most of our colleges owe their inception to such denominational zeal. But as soon as the college develops strength, it passes inevitably beyond mere denominational control. Church schools are often conspicuous successes. Church colleges are usually conspicuous failures. A church university is a contradiction in terms.

It is equally necessary that the college should be intensely Christian. The administrative officer should believe in the power of the best motives over the worst men and the application of great principles to little things. He should know that persons are more than the acts that they do. He should believe what most people practically deny, — that a sinner can be saved; and that he is worth saving. It is only on such a profoundly Christian basis that a college can be successfully conducted. A college which is not Christian is no college at all. For the faithful, hopeful, loving treatment of persons as free beings of boundless capacity and infinite worth is at once the essence of Christianity and the distinguishing mark of the true college.

Christianity in the college, as everywhere else in the world, presents the two aspects which Jesus contrasted in the parable of the two sons whom the father asked to work in his vineyard. There is the conscious, professed, organized Christianity, which joins the church and the association, attends

and takes part in meetings, and casts about to find or invent ways to make both the world and one's self better than they otherwise would be. Sometimes, unfortunately, the Christian of this type neglects that devotion of himself to such forms of good as are already established, — the intellectual tasks, the athletic interests, the social life of the institution. In that case the result is that, good as it means to be, good as in many respects it is, this type of Christianity fails to be appreciated by the majority of the students; the leadership of all forms of college life passes into other hands, and this avowed, expressed, organized Christianity lives at a poor dying rate, by faculty assistance and student toleration. People who forget the lesson of the parable that there are two types of Christianity, and confound this type with the whole of Christianity, sometimes take a very discouraged view of the condition of Christianity in our colleges.

What, then, is the other, the relatively unconscious, unprofessing type? Who is the Christian who, as Jesus says, in the judgment day will be surprised to find that he was a Christian at all? He is the man who lives for something bigger and better, loses himself in something wider and higher than himself. He does his work with a sense of responsibility for the honest improvement of his powers and opportunities, or, better still, with devotion to some aspect of scientific truth or human

welfare that has gotten hold of him. He enters heartily into the sports and enthusiasms of his fellows, sacrificing comfort and convenience to the promotion of these common ends. He shares his time and property with his friends, and supports generously their common undertakings. He stands up for what is right, yet always has a helping hand for the fellow who has fallen down. He looks forward to life as a sphere where he is going to serve public interests and promote social welfare, at the same time that he supports himself and his family.

Now, if this is Christianity, if the cultivation of these traits and aims is growth in Christian character, then our colleges are mighty agencies for the spread of Christianity. No man can go through one of them, and catch its spirit, without becoming a better Christian for the remainder of his days.

Of course it is highly desirable that these two types of Christianity should understand and appreciate each other. Especially fortunate is the college where these two types coincide, where the most prominent members of church and association are at the same time the best fellows, and where the best fellows give their influence and support as officers and workers in distinctively Christian organizations. In some men's colleges, and in most women's colleges, this is happily the case. If, however, we can have but one of the two types, as

often happens, we must agree with Jesus that good work and good fellowship on a basis unconsciously Christian are better than a conscious profession which remains self-centred and self-satisfied, outside the more genial and generous current of the life of the community.

The last feature of the college, but by no means the least significant, is this genial, generous, social life. Even if nothing were learned save by absorption through the pores, the intimate association with picked men of trained minds for the most impressionable years of one's life would almost be worth while. To take one's place in such a community, to bear one's share in its common interests and common endeavor, to take the social consequences of one's attitude and actions in a community which sees clearly and speaks frankly, rewards generously and punishes unmercifully, is the best school of character and conduct ever yet devised.

This is the leading consideration in determining the desirable size of a college. As Plato says of the state we may say of the college, it should be as large as is consistent with organic unity. If some types of life and character — the rich or the poor, the independent or the conservative, the high scholar or the good fellow, the athlete or the man of artistic temperament — are left out, then it is too small. If, on the other hand, a man can be a

2

mere unit in a mass toward which he feels little or no definite responsibility, — if his specific contribution is not needed and his individual opinion does not count, if the games are played, and the papers are edited, and the societies are managed, and things generally are conducted by experts whom he merely knows by sight and reputation, — then that college is too large for him; he will probably come out of it as small as he went in.

For the most enjoyable and profitable social life the college community inevitably breaks up into little groups, — fraternities, musical associations, athletic teams, and clubs for scientific, literary, historical, and philosophical study. Extension and intensity are inversely proportional; and a man who misses the closer contact and warmer fellowship of these smaller groups misses much that is most valuable in college life. Athletics are carried to excess, as is everything else in which youth take a leading part. But the incidental excesses of a few individuals are much more than counterbalanced by the increased physical health, moral tone, and freedom from asceticism and effeminacy in the college community as a whole. Cut off as they are from the natural outdoor tasks and sports, from chores and workshops, from hunting and fishing, from sailing and riding, some artificial outlet for physical vigor is absolutely essential. Some object for community enthusiasm, community loyalty,

and community sacrifice is equally a moral and a social necessity. The worst evil of athletics is not the effort put forth by the athletes themselves, but the extent to which these interests absorb the time and conversation, the thought and aspiration, of both combatants and non-combatants. Even this evil, great as it is, is small in comparison to the moral evils which would infest a group of vigorous young men from whom some such outlet was withheld.

The fraternities and societies likewise have slight possibilities of evil, but accomplish an overwhelming preponderance of good. It is through them, directly or indirectly, that the most effective personal and social influence can be brought to bear on those who need it. Occasionally a fraternity drops to the level of making mere good fellowship an exclusive end, to which scholarship, morality, efficiency are merely incidental. A college is fortunate which at any given time does not have one or two fraternities that are tending in this direction. But the contempt of their rivals, the influence of their graduates, the self-respect of the better members themselves, together with direct or indirect faculty remonstrance, serve to bring a fraternity to its senses in a quarter of the time it would take to straighten out an equal number of isolated individuals. Isolated good and isolated evil are more nearly on an equality. But good influence can be

organized and mobilized a hundred times as quickly and effectively as evil influence; and where the moral forces in faculty and students are alert, the fraternities serve as rallying points for the concentration of the good and the dispersion of the evil.

Departmental clubs, in which one or two members of the faculty meet informally with a few of the more interested students for conference on some phase of their subject, are perhaps the consummation of the college spirit. Modern methods of instruction, however, make contact in the laboratory over experiments and in the library in research so close that many of the regular classes assume more the aspect of a club than a class. The newest and best college libraries provide small rooms for the use of books by professors and students together in each literary and historical department, and regard such rooms quite as indispensable as the room where books are stored.

There is one serious danger, and only one, that besets the college. The ordinary objections, hazing, excessive athletics, dissipation, lawlessness, idleness, are due either to exaggeration of exceptional cases, or the unwarranted expectation that large aggregations of youth will conduct themselves with the decorum that is becoming where two or three mature saints are gathered together for conference and prayer. I grant that a man who cherishes this expectation will be disappointed; and if he chances

to be a college officer, and undertakes to realize this expectation, he will be deservedly miserable. With all its incidental follies and excesses, college conduct is more orderly, college judgment is more reasonable, college character is more earnest and upright, than are the judgment, conduct, and character of youth of the same age in factories, offices, and stores, or on farms or on shipboard. As far as these matters go, college is, physically, mentally, and morally, the safest place in the world for a young man.

The one serious danger is so subtle that the public has never suspected its existence; and even to many a college officer the statement of it will come as a surprise. It is the danger of missing that solitude which is the soil of individuality and the fertilizer of genius. College life is excessively gregarious. Men herd together so closely and constantly that they are in danger of becoming too much alike. The pursuit of four or five subjects at the same time tends to destroy that concentration of attention to one thing on which great achievement rests. The same feverish interest in athletics, the same level of gossip, the same attitude toward politics and religion tend to pass by contagion from the mass to the individual, and supersede independent reflection. The attractiveness and charm of this intense life of the college group tends to become an end in itself, so that

the very power which wholesomely takes the student out of himself into the group, invites him to stop in the group instead of going on into those intellectual and social interests which the college is supposed to serve. This devotion to college rather than to learning, to the fellows rather than to humanity, to fraternities and teams rather than to church and state, is a real danger to all students, and a very serious danger to the exceptional individuals who have the spark of originality hidden within their souls. The same forces that expand small, and even average, men may tend to repress and stunt these souls of larger endowment. To guard against this — to make sure that the man of latent genius is protected against this deadening influence of social compulsion toward mediocrity — is one of the great duties of the wise college professor. He must show the student of unusual gifts that he is appreciated and understood, and encourage him to live in the college atmosphere as one who is at the same time apart from it and above it. The formation of little groups, temporary or permanent, among the more earnest students for mutual recognition and support, groups which actually do for a student while in college what Phi Beta Kappa attempts to do in a merely formal and honorary way afterwards, may help these choice minds to stem this tide of gregarious mediocrity. Wherever the faculty is alert to detect

its presence, even genius can thrive and flourish in a college atmosphere.

Such is the college. It is an institution where young men and young women study great subjects, under broad teachers, in a liberty which is not license and a leisure which is not idleness, — with unselfish participation in a common life and intense devotion to minor groups within the larger body and special interests inside the general aim; conscious that they are critically watched by friendly eyes, too kind ever to take unfair advantage of their weaknesses and errors, yet too keen ever to be deceived.

The function of the college follows so obviously from the concept that it requires but a word to draw the inference. It makes its graduates the heirs of all the wisdom and experience of the ages, placing, if not within their actual memories, at least within the reach of their developed powers and trained methods, any great aspect of nature or humanity they may hereafter wish to acquire. It gives each one of them a sense of achievement and mastery in some one subject of his choice, giving him, in that one department at least, the impulse to read its books and study its problems as long as he shall live. It places its alumnus on a plane of social equality with the best people he will ever meet, and gives him a spirit of helpfulness toward the lowliest with whom he will ever come in con-

tact. It makes him the servant of the state in wise counsel and effective leadership. It gives to the church ministers who can do more than turn the cranks of ecclesiastical machinery and repeat ritualized tradition, prophets who gain first-hand contact with the purposes of God. It prepares men who will bring to the study and practice of law ability to apply eternal principles and ancient precedents to the latest phases of our complex civilization. It trains its graduates who practice medicine to give each patient the benefit of whatever science is developing of healing efficacy for his particular case. It trains men who are to be engineers, bankers, manufacturers, merchants, to put the solidity and integrity of natural law into the structures that they rear, the institutions they control, the fabrics they produce, and the transactions they direct. It trains men and women who will give to domestic and social life that unselfishness and geniality which come of having the mind lifted above the selfish, the artificial, the petty, into sincere and simple intercourse with the good, the true, and the beautiful.

The function of the college, then, is not mental training on the one hand nor specialized knowledge on the other. Incidentally, it may do these things at the beginning and at the end of the course, as a completion of the unfinished work of the school, and a preparation for the future pursuits of the

33
120

university. The function of the college is liberal education, — the opening of the mind to the great departments of human interest; the opening of the heart to the great spiritual motives of unselfishness and social service; the opening of the will to opportunity for wise and righteous self-control. Having a different task from either school or university, it has developed a method and spirit, a life and leisure, of its own. Judged by school standards it appears weak, indulgent, superficial. Judged by university standards it appears vague, general, indefinite. Judge it by its true standard as an agency of liberal education, judge it by its function to make men and women who have wide interests, generous aims, and high ideals, and it will vindicate itself as the most efficient means yet devised to take well-trained boys and girls from the school and send them either on to the university or out into life with a breadth of intellectual view no subsequent specialization can ever take away; a strength of moral purpose the forces of materialistic selfishness can never break down; a passion for social service neither popular superstition nor political corruption can deflect from its chosen path.

XVI

Alumni Ideals

TO weigh material goods in the scales of personal values, and measure life by the standard of love; to prize health as contagious happiness, wealth as potential service, reputation as latent influence, learning for the light it can shed, power for the help it can give, station for the good it can do; to choose in each case what is best on the whole, and accept cheerfully incidental evils involved; to put my whole self into all that I do, and indulge no single desire at the expense of myself as a whole; to crowd out fear by devotion to duty, and see present and future as one; to treat others as I would be treated, and myself as I would my best friend; to lend no oil to the foolish, but let my light shine freely for all; to make no gain by another's loss, and buy no pleasure with another's pain; to harbor no thought of another which I should be unwilling that other should know; to say nothing unkind to amuse myself, and nothing false to please others; to take no pride in weaker men's failings, and bear no malice toward those who do wrong; to pity the selfish no less than the poor, the proud as much as the outcast, and the cruel

even more than the oppressed ; to worship God in all that is good and true and beautiful ; to serve Christ wherever a sad heart can be made happy or a wrong will set right ; and to recognize God's coming kingdom in every institution and person that helps men to love one another.

The Riverside Press

Electrotyped and printed by H. O. Houghton & Co.

Cambridge, Mass., U. S. A.

WHAT IS RELIGION: and Other Student Questions

BY HENRY S. PRITCHETT, *President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.*

Narrow 12mo, \$1.00, *net.* Postage extra.

Five vigorous, broad-minded addresses to college students, written by President Pritchett who seeks to influence young men who are especially under the sway of the modern scientific spirit. He shows how in the larger sense, Science includes the beliefs of Religion in its scope and that the two are not mutually exclusive. Mr. Pritchett believes that if the student's attention and his interest are to be drawn to higher things it must be through a leadership which faces frankly the philosophy of the time and which deals with the facts of science and of religion in a spirit of intellectual sincerity.

Published by HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO.

BOSTON AND NEW YORK

ON THE THRESHOLD

BY REV. THEODORE T. MUNGER.

Crown 8vo, 1.00.

“ It is the frank, wise, inspiring work of a man who carries a high ideal into the circumstances of an average American community. The book is remarkable in its union of enthusiasm with good sense. Dr. Munger is an idealist, a man of intuition, quick to see and keen to feel the higher spiritual aspects of the world. He strikes always at the central principle of his subject. There is nothing ascetic, nothing narrow, in the type of life he commends; his influence goes toward a manhood which is large, vital, and joyful, as well as sound and faithful.” —
The Century, New York.

Published by HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO.

BOSTON AND NEW YORK

ROUTINE AND IDEALS

BY LE BARON R. BRIGGS, *President of Radcliffe College.*

16mo, \$1.00, *net.* Postage 9 cents.

“Common sense enriched by culture describes everything which Dean, or, as he ought now to be called, President, Briggs says or writes. The genius of sanity, sound judgment, and high aim seems to preside over his thought, and he combines in an unusual degree the faculty of vision and the power of dealing with real things in a real way.” — *The Outlook*, New York.

SCHOOL, COLLEGE, AND CHARACTER

BY THE AUTHOR OF “ROUTINE AND IDEALS.”

16mo, \$1.00, *net.* Postage 8 cents.

“With the soundest good sense and with frequent humorous flashes, Dean Briggs takes students and parents into his confidence, and shows them the solution of college problems from the point of view, not of the ‘office’ but of a very clear-thinking, whole-souled man *in* the ‘office’” — *The World's Work*, New York.

Published by HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO.

BOSTON AND NEW YORK

MORNINGS IN THE COLLEGE CHAPEL

By FRANCIS G. PEABODY, *Plummer Professor of Christian Morals in Harvard University.* 16mo, \$1.25.

“The book consists of short, pregnant addresses to the Harvard undergraduates on spiritual themes. So varied in theme, so rich in thought, so lighted up with pertinency and beauty of illustration, and, finally, so rare in their power of spiritual uplift are these addresses as to suggest how literally Hamlet may have meant it when he cried, ‘O God, I could be bounded in a nutshell, and yet count myself king of infinite space.’” — REV. FRANCIS TIFFANY, in the *Boston Herald*.


AFTERNOONS IN THE COLLEGE CHAPEL


By THE AUTHOR OF “MORNINGS IN THE COLLEGE CHAPEL.” 16mo, \$1.25.

“These addresses are nobly thoughtful, yet extremely simple and unaffected, strong, direct, and tender in the uplifting spirituality of their appeal.” — *The Christian Advocate*, New York.

Published by HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO.
BOSTON AND NEW YORK

H 262 83





AUG 83

**N. MANCHESTER,
INDIANA 46962**



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 022 255 045 2